DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 021 RC 013 403

AUTHOR Leap, William
TITLE American Indian Language Education.
INSTITUTION National Center for Bilingual Research, Los Alamitos, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Dec 81
NOTE 166p.; Cooperative Agreement 00-CA-80-0001.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *American Indian Education; *American Indian Languages; American Indians; Bilingual Education; *Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language; *Federal Indian Relationship; Language Proficiency; Language Research; *Language Role; Native Language Instruction; Program Implementation; *Second Language Programs; Staff Development; Tribes
IDENTIFIERS American Indian History

ABSTRACT

Prepared for the National Center for Bilingual Research, the document provides information on the "state of the art" in American Indian language education and presents a full picture of the situation exploring concepts (e.g., self-determination, Indian language diversity) and concerns (e.g., tribal reluctance to see Indian language instruction used indiscriminately for schooling-related purposes). Topics discussed in the five chapter paper include: Indian education as an equal opportunity issue (such as tribal self-determination and tribally controlled education); definition of American Indians (usage of Native American or American Indians, state, federal, and self-identified); Indian language fluency as an issue in Indian education; local responses to language needs in Indian education (pertaining to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, implementing Indian language arts programs, certification of Indian teachers, and federal responsibilities in Indian Education); and research needs in Indian language education (descriptive studies, language census issues, English language arts needs, legislation and policy implications). Appendices record statements of needs and priorities in Indian language education. A 62-item unannotated bibliography concludes the document. (ERB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218021

AMERICAN INDIAN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

William Leap

December, 1981

Reports

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Victor E Rodriguez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

✓ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

RC018403

national center for bilingual research, 4665 lampson avenue, los alamitos, ca 90720

JUN 1982
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

AMERICAN INDIAN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

William Leap

December, 1981

03-81

national center for bilingual research, 4665 lampson avenue, los alamitos, CA 90720, telephone (213) 598-0481

The material in this publication was prepared under Cooperative Agreement 00-CA-80-0001 from the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Institute of Education or of any other agency of the United States of Education or of any other agency of the United States government, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
NTCA EDUCATION POLICY STATEMENT: "Who Makes Indian Education Policy?"	4
CHAPTER I: INDIAN EDUCATION AS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ISSUE	7
Early History of Indian Education	7
Indian Education in the Twentieth Century	9
Tribal Self-Determination	10
Indian Education Organizations	12
Tribally Controlled Education	13
CHAPTER II: DEFINING THE POPULATION	16
Native Americans and American Indians	16
Federally Recognized Tribes	18
State Recognized Tribes	19
Self-Identified Indian Groups	20
Defining and Estimating American Indian Populations	21
Indian Residence Patterns	22
Federal Definitions of Indians	24
CHAPTER III: INDIAN LANGUAGE FLUENCY AS AN ISSUE IN INDIAN EDUCATION	27
Indian Languages	27
Recent Counts of Indian Languages	37
English and Indian Language Fluency	39

CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
Bilingual Education Needs	42
Indian Language Factors and Academic Achievement	44
The Language Issues Within Indian Education	47
National Study of American Indian Education	52
Indian Language Instruction and Classroom-Based Research	58
Indian Language Research	60
Indian English	63
Summary	65
CHAPTER IV: LOCAL RESPONSES TO LANGUAGE NEEDS IN INDIAN EDUCATION	69
Federal Support for Local Programs	70
Bureau of Indian Affairs	79
Project Development at the Tribal Level: Educational Needs Assessment	81
Implementing an Indian Language Arts Program	84
Some Problems in Indian Language Education: Staffing and Classroom Resources	86
Responses to the Staffing Problems	87
Certification of Indian Teachers	89
Instructional Aides	91
Linguistic Issues	92
Special Costs	94
Technical Assistance	95
Federal Responsibilities in Indian Education	96
Summary	98

CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
CHAPTER V: DIMENSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR INQUIRY	100
Research Needs in Indian Language Education	104
I. Basic Descriptive Studies	105
II. Language Census Issues	109
III. English Language Arts Needs	111
IV. Classroom Based Inquiry	115
V. Legislation and Policy Implications	116
VI. The Indian Language Speaker as Researchers . . .	118
APPENDIX II	120
Recommendations of the Conference on Priorities in American Indian Language Work	120
Lake Superior Association Working Paper on Native American Languages	127
Policy Recommendations: SENABEC Conference, Jackson, MS, 1977	134
Panel Presentation of Dr. Lee Antell, ECS Indian Education Project	141
BIBLIOGRAPHY	145

AMERICAN INDIAN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

A Report to the
National Center for Bilingual Research

William L. Leap
Project Director

INTRODUCTION

This document has been prepared at the request of the National Center for Bilingual Research, Los Alamitos, CA, to provide information on the "state of the art" in American Indian language education. To function as a bilingual research center with a truly national scope, NCBR staff had to become oriented, and oriented quickly, to a full picture of the American Indian language education situation. This required an exploration of concepts (e.g., self-determination, Indian language diversity) and concerns (e.g., tribal reluctance to see Indian language instruction used indiscriminately for schooling-related purposes). It required information on the inventory of the actors (including both agencies and persons) involved in the attempt to come to grips with these issues and an evaluation of the outcomes of those efforts. Planning for the Indian components of the NCBR research agenda for the future years can only be effected in terms of these considerations.

The staff assembled to prepare this document include: Sandra Amendola, Paul Cissna, Signithia Fordham, William Leap (project director), Donna Longo, Cesare Marino, Jeffrey Phillips, and Ann Renker, all of The American University, Washington, D.C. To broaden the sensitivity of project staff on selected issues, background papers were prepared by Ann Marie Zaharlick, formerly associated with the Pueblo Indian Bilingual-Multicultural Teacher Training Program at the University of Albuquerque, New Mexico, and currently on faculty at the Ohio State

University, Columbus; and Georgianna Tiger, formerly the associate director of the National Congress of American Indians, Washington, D.C.

The essay has been reviewed in pre-final form by Ron Andrade, Executive Director of the National Congress of American Indians, Washington, D.C., and by members of the NCAI Education Concerns Committee. The arguments presented here have benefited directly from that review, but I, alone, take responsibility for the final form of this document.

Project staff prepared a series of reports summarizing the work of federal, state, local and tribal-level agencies in Indian language education. Issues raised in those reports have been integrated into the text at various points in the argument. To provide a more detailed perspective on the work of specific agencies in these areas, several of the reports will be reviewed and re-drafted, and will be made available as a supplement to this report.

A variety of additional sources, some of which are identified in the bibliography, were also consulted by project staff; the development of the overall argument in this document was, at times, greatly influenced by data from these sources of information. The project director retains sole responsibility, however, for the selection and the interpretation of issues which it has come to contain.

Indian self-determination, as defined under the purview of PL 93-638 and elsewhere, is a critical element underlying all areas of Indian policy-making and program development. Statements discussing needs and priorities in Indian language education research are not exempt from the constraints of this principle. The reasoning behind this statement has

been clearly outlined in an educational policy statement developed by the staff of the Education Component of the National Tribal Chairmen's Association and adopted by the membership of the full Association on April 16, 1980. The full text of that statement is reprinted on the following pages.

William L. Leap
Project Director

NATIONAL TRIBAL CHAIRMEN'S ASSOCIATION
EDUCATION POLICY STATEMENT:

Who Makes Indian Education Policy?

Adopted: April 16, 1980

Tribal survival through education and on tribal terms is an essential goal of the National Tribal Chairmen's Association. NTCA's Constitution and Bylaws provide that three of the purposes of the Association are "to approve the local and national Indian policies before they are implemented by the federal, state, and local governments . . ., to demand that every federal agency recognize the Indian population for whom the U.S. Government has trust responsibility as enacted by the laws of the Congress of the U.S. by executive orders, judicial decisions and treaties unique to Indian tribes, and to represent the reservation and federally recognized tribes and demand prior consultation by the U.S. Government . . ."

It is federal law that education is part of the trust responsibility of the federal government and that education is a right of the federally recognized tribes (25 CFR Part 31a.3) NTCA has the responsibility to advocate for the federally recognized tribes regarding education policy as it is determined by the directions and philosophies of the tribes. Such tribal directions and philosophies encompass cultural integrity and transmission, economic survival, and the well-being and survival of their tribal members living now, as well as future generations. NTCA is committed to tribal self-determination in every aspect. We affirm that sovereign tribes have the inherent power to: elect their leaders; to determine their own eligibility for membership; to delegate authority to various on-reservation committees, boards, and other groups; to develop their own education codes and comprehensive education plans; to set priorities for scholarship awards and other programs; and, to deal with all authorized representatives of the federal government on a government-to-government basis.

The elected chairmen, presidents, governors, chiefs, and headmen of the federally recognized tribes, who are our members, provide tribal direction to us at the National Tribal Chairmen's Association. We, in turn, present these policy determinations in the form of position papers and testimony to the Administration, the federal agencies, and the Congress. NTCA firmly asserts that Indian-oriented and Indian professional and technical assistance organizations are not entitled to

set policy on any matters relating to Indian education unless they have been specifically authorized to do so by tribal governments. At the August 7th Annual Convention of NTCA, the membership passed a resolution regarding this issue. The resolution noted that "effective technical assistance has been most consistently provided by agencies, organizations, and individuals who remain responsible and accountable to tribal governments and their delegated education authorities." The NTCA resolved that "federal and other officials concerned with Indian education affirm the time-honored and legislatively mandated principles of tribal self-determination and as a visible gesture of that affirmation, only recognize the policies of those organizations which have the documented sanction and endorsement to implement those policies as detailed by the sovereign tribal governments of the various Indian tribes of this country."

Non-Indian, but Indian-oriented and other Indian technical assistance, professional and fraternal organizations who are aware of the sovereign status of the federally recognized tribes, and who are aware of the special relationship, responsibilities and obligations of the federal government to the governments of the federally recognized tribes as established by statutes, laws, and treaties, should at all times act to support the federally recognized tribes and their tribal organizations. While NTCA recognizes that some organizations and some of the non-federally recognized groups do not feel an obligation to support the government-to-government relationship of the federally recognized tribes, there is an increasing awareness being demonstrated by many of these organizations that the education needs of the nation's racial minority populations is legally different from the education rights of the federally recognized tribes.

Professional and technical assistance education organizations including quasi-governmental organizations should refrain from testifying before the Congress or from forwarding statements or resolutions to other segments of the federal government on policy matters that have not been previously endorsed and sanctioned by tribal governments and their tribal organizations. When professional and technical assistance organizations do this they are bypassing tribal governments and are violating the precepts of tribal sovereignty.

Several of the professional and technical assistance organizations and other federal education groups have contributed and do contribute significant education services to the tribes. NTCA believes that communication and informational linkages should be maintained between the tribal organizations and the professional and technical assistance organizations.

. . . The stratified nature of state-level structures and super-structures means precisely that nothing that significantly benefits the lower strata can endure unless it benefits the upper strata even more.

Marvin Harris
Cultural Materialism
(New York City: Random House, 1979, p. 110)

CHAPTER I: INDIAN EDUCATION AS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ISSUE

Formal education processes and programs are not new to the Indian experience in America. While it is often fashionable to think of Indian tribes living in a state of blissful ignorance before the coming of Western Civilization to the shores of the "New World," tribal lifestyle contained ample provisions for providing members with the information, skills, and sensitivities they needed to function effectively and creatively within their tribe. Such opportunities for education were open to persons of all age levels, and the opportunities ranged in focus from the most formalized (e.g., initiation into secret societies) to the most informal (uncle and nephew on a three-day hunt). There may have been ways of describing persons who were "under-educated," ignorant, or unschooled, but to the extent that these terms come down to contemporary times, the phrases expressing these ideas give more emphasis to the individual's decision not to receive instruction than to the failure of the larger social whole to make it available.

Early History of Indian Education

In early encounters between Indians and European colonial powers formal European education was used as a mechanism for civilizing and Christianizing tribal members. At first, "boarding schools" were set up at some distance from the tribal homeland (Indians in Florida, for example, were sent to Cuba); later, school sites were established within or adjacent to tribal communities themselves. There is evidence that some tribes welcomed the coming of such new opportunities for

learning but there is also evidence that others were more skeptical of the programs and the motives behind them. It is clear that in some cases the schooling idea caught on--the Cherokees and Choctaws, for example, reached a point where they ran their own school programs and taught students both in English and in the tribe's own language. As a result of such programs, many Indians achieved higher levels of education than many of the non-Indian settlers who were occupying the communities adjacent to the tribal ones.

A requirement that the federal government provide educational services to Indian children was included within most of the treaties signed between individual, sovereign Indian tribes and the federal government. In most instances, it was assumed that the federal government would establish and maintain some sort of schooling program(s) specifically designed to meet the unique needs of the tribes' membership. School did, in fact, play an important role in the operation of the reservation system in the American west. These areas of land specifically set aside and held "in trust" by the federal government on behalf of the particular tribes began to be established once Anglo settlements, railroads, and other by-products of the western expansion began to encroach on the tribes' aboriginal land base. It was never expected, however, that the tribes would remain within these boundaries on a permanent basis. Treaty terms not withstanding, the Federal government viewed the reservations as an interim solution to the Indian "question," and numerous policies were developed and

implemented to guarantee that the reservation experience would, in fact, be a transitory one.

In turn, the on-reservation schooling programs, many of which were administered under federal contract by the various Christian missionary societies, were designed to provide Indian students with basic literacy and computation skills, as well as an awareness of moral precepts which were acceptable to American society as a whole. English was the language of instruction; Indian language arts, tribal histories, and tribal cultural details had no place within the course of study offered by these schools. Federally operated secondary schools--such as the ones established at Carlisle, Pennsylvania and Haskell, Kansas--were designed in terms of the same, externally based priorities. Since these schools were located far from the students' families and tribal contexts, it became much easier for these schools to function as agents of culture change and social assimilation.

Indian Education in the Twentieth Century

Schools have continued to occupy key roles in federal Indian policies since the beginning of the twentieth century. At the same time that the Brookings Institute's report on "the problem of Indian administration" (Meriam, ed. 1928) called for the strengthening of on-reservation, Indian-based, self-governing mechanisms, the report urged that on-reservation educational opportunities be strengthened so that the bond between school and local community could be intensified. The formalization of tribal governments under the terms of the Indian Reorganization (Wheeler-Howard) Act of 1834 and the expansion of

federally operated on-reservation day and boarding school facilities came as direct and paralleled responses to these findings.

The report also prompted the development of programs under the terms of the Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1934, to allow the federal government (acting through the BIA to contract with public schools) to provide Indian students with educational services. The principles underlying the JOM program (as it came to be called) paved the way for the successive shifting from the federal to the state and local levels of other services guaranteed to the tribes by the treaties and trust agreements. This trend culminated in the outright termination of all federal services to several tribes in the 1950's. In other instances, the trend sparked a series of questions about the boundaries distinguishing federal vs. state responsibility for service delivery to the tribes. The controversy over federal and state responsibility for service delivery continues to be hotly debated up to this day.

Tribal Self-Determination

More recently, the place occupied by schooling in federal Indian policy has undergone significant changes. Tribal re-assertion of their sovereignty, and thus their inherent right to control the decision-making processes which affect the lives of their memberships, led to the creation of the Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act of 1972 (PL93-638). The Act gives the tribes the means through which they can contract directly for any service which the federal government might otherwise provide to the tribal membership on their behalf, while health care, legal services, resource management,

and other treaty-guaranteed services also fall under the provisions of this Act. The most positive implications of the ISDE Assistance Act is its potential to enable tribes to establish control over their own educational destiny. To date, more than 40 tribes have utilized the "638-option" and established their own tribally controlled schooling programs. In those instances, tribal authorities, not the BIA, make decisions about curriculum, course offerings, opportunities for parental involvement, school calendar, and staff selection.

There are tribes, however, who are more skeptical about the opportunities allowed by 638 and who prefer to have the BIA continue to provide services on their members' behalf, as has been the case in previous years. The point is, such decisions are as appropriate under the terms of the Self-Determination Act as are decisions to contract for such services directly. Either way, the tribe, and not some external authority, has established the terms of service delivery. Tribal consultation on the issue has been heeded in both cases.

Only since the passage of the Self-Determination Act and its reaffirmation of tribal sovereignty could Indian educational services begin to address the issue of equal educational opportunities for Indian students. Until recently, schooling services for Indian students were part of larger and more inclusive strategies designed to "manage" the tribal entities according to externally-based agendas. From the earliest periods of history, society has sought to assimilate Indians into the American mainstream. Assimilation, however, would have meant the death of tribal cultures and languages, the destruction

of tribal corporate entities, and the end of special federal services to Indians until tribal entities began to assume responsibilities for defining purposes of Indian education and for seeing to the implementation of programs designed in those terms.

Indian Education Organizations

Today, Indian tribes and tribal communities are actively involved at all operational levels of Indian education. The two major national organizations representing tribal interests in Washington, D.C., the National Congress of American Indians and the National Tribal Chairmen's Association, have both had active educational components in recent years. Both NCAI and NTCA were aggressively involved in the decisions about the placement of Indian education services within the new Department of Education, the reorganization of educational service delivery within the Bureau of Indian Affairs as mandated by Title XI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and other such actions. Education issues remain visible areas of concern at the regional and annual meetings of both organizations.

There is, likewise, a National Indian Education Association designed to provide a forum (and basis for advocacy) for specific educational concerns advanced by Indian educators and education groups. The several community college programs providing higher education services to reservation and rural tribes formed the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC), and the numerous tribally and community based school programs formed the Coalition of Indian Controlled School Boards for similar reasons.

Tribal activities on the state level have led, in many instances, to the formation of Indian Education "offices" within state departments of education or public instruction. This has insured that more than "head-counting services" will be provided to the tribes by state level educational authorities. States with Indian Affairs Commissions often have an educational committee or other component, as well, to give tribal governments another mechanism for voicing their concerns to the governor and to the legislature. State-wide Indian education associations, bilingual education associations, and other conferences provide a forum for such discussion and advocacy.

Tribal activities are most visible today on the local level. School districts using federal (and often state-level) funding to provide educational services which will meet the "special needs" of Indian students are required by legislation to form a Parents' Committee which will oversee the disbursement of the funds and guarantee that the effort does meet Indian needs. Many an Indian parent has received his/her first orientation to the complexities of Indian educational equality and to the need for increasing tribal control over Indian educational services through these experiences. Indian parents are equally active within the classroom itself, as instructional aides or as resource persons for some particularly focused, school-based program.

Tribally Controlled Education Programs

In instances where tribes run their own schools, either by contracting for the funds from the BIA or by assuming control over the

local public school district, parental and tribal involvement is even more sharply evident. One by-product of such tribally controlled programs has been the appearance of tribal departments of education as visible components of tribal government structure. At present, most of these TDE programs are supported primarily or exclusively with tribal revenues, another indication of the concern and commitment with which Indian tribes are handling the educational experiences of their children.

The school programs and educational experiences which emerge under such tribally-oriented auspices may not always parallel the expectations usually associated with elementary and secondary schooling in America. One Navajo educator has used the following terms to describe the "exit criteria" toward which all educational services provided by one of the locally controlled schools on the Navajo reservation are directed:

> Upon graduation from high school, students should demonstrate the following competencies: (1) fluency in both English and Navajo; (2) communicativeness; (3) the ability to understand the speech behaviors, values, and attitudes of Navajo elders; (4) the ability to demonstrate appropriate clan membership, privileges, and protocols; and (5) the ability to discuss Navajo tribal government, current issues, organizations, accomplishments, and anticipated future developments (Pfeiffer 1975, p. 137)

Programs designed in these terms were simply <u>not</u> possible under more traditional BIA or non-Indian dominated public school contexts. And to be effective, such tribally oriented school programs require the use of a series of educational assumptions fundamentally different from those governing the operation of Indian schools in previous years.

Non-Indians (and some Indian educators as well) may want to challenge the validity of these assumptions, arguing that tribally sensitive schooling programs are not any more inherently effective than programs designed in terms of any other singular orientation. But tribes no longer find it either possible to accept such criticism or necessary to accept its caution. The record shows clearly that educational goals and objectives defined in terms external to tribally based interests have not provided, and do not provide, quality educational experiences to Indian students. Low achievement scores, early school-leaving patterns, increasing student apathy toward the schooling process, the failure of Indian students to select careers in the hard sciences and in the technical fields all attest to the gap which currently exists between educational goals and student attainments throughout Indian country. The use of self-determination principles in Indian education represents the only meaningful alternative to present conditions, specifically because these principles, when carried over into educational practices, require not only the development of new directions in curriculum design but new approaches to staff hiring, teacher certification, classroom management, parental involvement, school calendar arrangement, and a host of other issues ordinarily "taken for granted" within any school program. Determining the use of such new approaches could lead to different curricula within particular tribal contexts. What impact the use of such approaches will have on educational service delivery and on broader areas of tribal interests, will represent two of the educational issues confronting all Indian tribes in the 1980's.

CHAPTER II: DEFINING THE POPULATION

Numerous studies have been conducted to identify the problems and remedies associated with the education of Indian students. Not surprisingly, many of these studies trace the cause of Indian educational failures to the Indian students themselves, noting that factors such as language background, cultural differences, cognitive processes, and behavioral patterns, work independently or jointly to the students' disadvantage within the classroom. The validity of attributing behavioral components to the Indian educational problem remains a subject of continuing debate. Studies of Indian cognitive processes (e.g., Feldman and Associates, 1973) often based their claims on analysis of standardized test scores using white, middle-class norms that assume familiarity with numerous concepts alien to the Indian child's life experiences. The more serious problem with these studies, however, lies in the failure to focus attention on the structural dimensions of the question, namely, that these structural facts have to be fully appreciated before a meaningful assessment of Indian educational problems can be attempted.

Native Americans and American Indians

The first of these structural facts has to do with the nature of the target population itself. It is possible, based strictly on the patterns of encounter between specific Indian tribes and the federal government, to divide the Indian peoples of America into several groupings, each of which has its own characteristic relationship to

Figure 1. The relationship of American Indians to other Native American groups.

non-Indian authorities. The schema in Figure 1 contains a full picture of the possibilities. As it suggests, all of the Indian peoples of the United States, together with the native inhabitants of Hawaii, Samoa, Puerto Rico, and other U.S. possessions can be termed NATIVE AMERICANS. Federal statutes use the term Native American in this generic, inclusive sense when referring to programs for which any descendents of any such "indigenous" inhabitant of the United States are eligible.

Within that grouping is a large segment which might, for present purposes, be termed AMERICAN INDIANS. This category excludes Native Hawaiians, Samoans, Puerto Ricans, and the like, but includes two distinctively contrasting populations: Persons whose claim to Indian ancestry is based solely in terms of self-identification and persons whose claim to Indian ancestry is based on self-identification combined with other, non-personalized evidences. Membership within a functioning, ongoing tribal aggregate would represent one of these non-personalized bits of evidence that would ultimately prove to be one of the most important factors.

Federally Recognized Tribes

A finer additional set of distinctions can be made within this large grouping of "American Indians" as determined by self-identification as well as non-personalized evidence. The distinction is based on the recognition given to the tribal aggregate by some level of American governmental authority. That is, there are some groups whose tribal continuity has been affirmed by the federal government, through treaty, trust agreement, Congressional action, or some other such means. These are the Federally Recognized Tribes and, in the unique instance of Alaska, Alaskan native communities. These tribes and communities, by virtue of their federal recognition, are eligible for a broad range of services from the federal government, many of which were specified in the terms of the treaties, the trust agreements, and the Congressional actions which defined their federal status in the first place. Such services may be provided to these tribes by any number of federal agencies.

While many federal agencies supply services to Indian tribes, it is the U.S. Department of the Interior, and specifically, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, that has the unique mandate to provide services designed specifically to meet Indian needs. (Only one set of guaranteed services is provided to the recognized tribes from agencies outside of the BIA's domain, namely health care which was transferred from BIA to the U.S. Public Health Service in 1955.) It should be noted, of course, that while the federally-recognized tribes are eligible for particular services from the federal government because of

their status as "treaty" Indians, this in no way affects their eligibility for federal services to which all other American citizens are entitled. The concept at issue here is sometimes expressed as the "dual citizenship" of the Indian peoples, a reference which is accurately applied only to federally recognized Indians, whose "dual" status is based on the fact that such peoples are, simultaneously, members of their sovereign tribal groups as well as members of the national citizenry. As such, they are entitled to receive two kinds of services from the federal government: Those to which they are entitled as members of a recognized tribe (as detailed in the treaties or trust agreements), and those to which they are entitled by virtue of their status as American citizens.

State Recognized Tribes

To date, a total of 476 tribal entities have received federal recognition, approximately half of which are located in Alaska and half of which are located in the "lower 48." These are not all of the "Indians" in America. Additionally, there are a number of Indian groups in the United States who do not have federal recognition, either because treaties and trust agreements were not established between the group and the federal government, or because of some other historical or social factor. Historically, treaties and trust agreements were the two mechanisms by which were Indian tribes who were entitled to receive services from the larger society "because of their status as Indians" were identified. Treaty-making and trust functions were restricted specifically to Congress since the responsibility to provide these

special services came to be recognized as a federal, and not a state or local level concern. Even so, many of the federally non-recognized tribes have, in recent years, received recognition by their state governments. State Recognized Tribes thus constitute a second category of Indians in America. Some states now hold land on these tribes' behalf or otherwise provide services to these groups on the basis of their status as state-recognized Indians. More generally, however, state responsibilities in this area have just begun to be explored and the whole question remains a controversial one.

There have been instances where state level recognition puts the group in a position to receive federal Indian services from sources outside of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Assistance under Part A of the Indian Education Act is one such case. But state level recognition does not qualify a group to receive services specifically earmarked for the federally-recognized tribes, e.g., educational support through the BIA, or medical care under Indian Health Service programs, since these services are made available as part of the federal-obligation to the federally-recognized tribes as defined under the treaties and the trust agreements.

Self-Identified Indian Groups

A third group of Indians can be distinguished from those discussed in the preceding paragraphs, these are the Indians whose status as Indians has never been acknowledged either by federal or state level authority. Some of these groups have petitioned for federal recognition under the rules and regulations promulgated by the Bureau

of Indian Affairs for this purpose. Others have no desire to seek federal recognition, stressing that the group's awareness of its own traditions is more significant than the on-paper validation from an alien domain.

Defining and Estimating American Indian Populations

The term "Indian" can be used to identify all, or any part of, three distinctive segments of the national population: Members of the federally-recognized tribes, members of the state-recognized tribes, and members of self-identified Indian groups. It is difficult to estimate how many persons fall within any one of these categories primarily because these distinctions are not always kept in mind when population figures are analyzed.

The U.S. Census reported 792 730 "Indians" and 34,378 Eskimos and Aleuts living in the United States in 1970, yielding a total of 827,108 Americans who self-identify with some form of Indian affiliation. The BIA estimated that 649,000 persons were residing on, or near, reservation lands as of 1977. Corrections for the seven-year interval allows a "ball-park estimate" that some 75% of the persons who self-identify as Indian people on their Census reports may actually be members of federally-recognized tribes. Such an estimate helps clarify the relative proportion of federal to non-federally recognized tribes, at least as of the time of the last Census. What the 1980 Census will show is another matter entirely.

As is always the case, members of federally-recognized tribes may choose not to identify themselves as Indians, or not to specify their

tribal affiliation when responding to Census worker questions. Others may choose not to respond to the questions in any areas, and still others (because of rural residence, urban migration, monolingual fluency in their ancestral language, or because of other factors) may not have even been contacted by Census personnel for this purpose. Moreover, since the time of the 1970 Census, a series of events have produced conditions leading to a sharp increase in the total number of Indians identified by the Household Census in 1970, as well as an increase in the proportion of the non-recognized to recognized Indian tribes as of 1980. These events include the passage of the Indian Education Act, the promulgation of rules and regulations by the BIA to allow non-recognized tribes to apply for federal status, and the increased pressure on state governments to identify and extend state-level recognition to the tribes and Indian groups in their domains.

Indian Residence Patterns

Members of particular tribal groupings may be found to live inside a single reservation boundary or other such designated Indian "land base." Tribal groupings may also be found in reservation areas that arise as a result of inter-tribal marriage, adoption, or other social processes, or within communities adjacent to reservation lands. Other areas include autonomous rural communities (especially the case if reservation lands are no longer being maintained by the federal authorities) and/or within urban contexts.

Indian resident patterns are not governed exclusively by state boundaries. Members of the same tribe may reside in adjacent states (as is the case for the members of Navajo nation, which itself occupies land in Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Utah) or in non-adjacent states, as in the case of families who moved into Los Angeles, Seattle, Chicago, Dallas, Phoenix, and other urban areas. Still other family members maintain residence on ancestrally owned lands. No single set of factors can be used to identify or to predict the distribution of Indian peoples within the United States, and no single set of conditions can be found to account for patterns of distribution.

The Navajo nation is the largest single aggregate of Indian peoples in the United States: The on-reservation population constitutes some 16% of the nation's total Indian population. The next largest aggregate in Oklahoma has approximately 11% of the total Indian population. Parts of Arizona not included within the Navajo reservation, the state of New Mexico plus the area around El Paso, Texas, and the Los Angeles-San Diego metroplex each contain the third largest ranking aggregate of Indian persons, some 8% of the total Indian population in each case. Clearly, reservation residence, state boundaries, regional groupings, urban migration patterns, as well as a number of other principles linking several population segments within a state, may all play their part in defining the relative distribution of the American Indian population within the national boundaries. What part might be played by any one specific factor depends, of course, on

the particular state-tribal group, urban area, or geographic region whose specific population is in question.

It should not be concluded from these observations that there is no way to determine how many tribes of Indian peoples there are in the United States. Traditionally, all Indian tribes had ways of determining who their members were, and where the boundaries separating members from non-members were to be drawn. The Indian Reorganization (or the Wheeler-Howard) Act of 1934 affirmed the right of tribal governments to establish their own membership criteria. Recently, in Martinez vs. Santa Clara Pueblo, the U.S. Supreme Court reaffirmed this aspect of tribal sovereignty. Most tribes have either specific directives in their constitutions or some other organizing statements which define their criteria for membership such as blood quantum, tribal background of the parent, residence at time of birth, or location of permanent residence within the reservation boundary. A number of additional factors are also employed by the tribes to designate membership criteria.

Federal Definitions of Indians

Few agencies at any level of administration outside of the tribal group choose to follow tribal membership rolls when determining "who Indians are" for purposes of their operations. Instead, a variety of criteria have been developed, some of which are more sensitive to Indian historical reality, cultural diversity, and tribal sovereignty than others.

Five of the definitions of "Indian" employed by federal agencies that play critical roles in the Indian education field are:

Table 1: Federal Definitions of "Indian."

Definition	Agencies Using Definition
1) Members of a corporate unit continuing integrity whose status as such has been recognized by the federal government	Bureau of Indian Affairs Indian Health Service
2) Members of federally and/or state recognized tribal groups, or descendents in the first or second degree of members of such groups; are either Eskimo, Aleut, or other Alaskan native; or are members of other groups determined to be Indian for purposes of the program	Office of Indian Education U.S. Department of Education
3) Resident of a land base specifically acknowledged to be Indian land by either federal or state-level authority	U.S. Department of Commerce
4) Self-identification as an Indian or being of Indian ancestry	National Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities U.S. Bureau of the Census
5) Members of some self-identified "native corporation" including but not limited to a recognized Indian Tribe	U.S. Department of Transportation

Thus, depending upon the agency in question, a wide-ranging sense of the parameters governing the Indian "target population" could be obtained. The sensitivity of each agency's understanding of Indian educational needs and the effectiveness of each agency's efforts to respond to those needs

in terms of its program mandates can only be evaluated in terms of the definition of "Indian" which underlies each agency's operation. Many federal agencies, including the programs operating under the Title I, Title VII, and Basic Skills ESEA mandates, operate without any such definition of "Indian" or criteria defining eligibility for "Indian-related" services under its programs. This serves only to bring further complication to any attempt to estimate the size of the Indian population, the seriousness of any of the needs identified within it, or the extent to which those needs are already being addressed by available federal, state, and local services.

The fact that the federal government is required, under the terms of the treaties and trust agreements, to provide education and other such services to one segment of this national Indian population--those members of the federally recognized tribes and Alaskan native communities--cannot be disregarded in this discussion. But even the diversity and heterogeneity found within that grouping present the policy-maker, educator, and researcher with a mosaic of almost frightening complexity. For this reason, whether the topic is education, health, social services, law, or any other problem area, Indian related issues can only be explored in terms of their inherent diversities, just as (and for similar reasons) tribally-specific perspectives on such issues may offer the most meaningful approach to analysis and problem solving within these areas.

CHAPTER III: INDIAN LANGUAGE FLUENCY AS AN ISSUE IN INDIAN EDUCATION

There are important historical realities contained within the heterogeneity discussed in the preceding section: Each of the tribes and Alaskan native groups has had its own set of experiences with regard to its interaction with the larger society. Treaties and trust agreements, by establishing lasting ties between specific tribal groups and the federal government, acknowledge the fact that each tribe has its own political sovereignty and that this sovereignty must be respected in every instance of federal-tribal interaction. The uniqueness of the specific tribal groups was established long before the impact of European colonization.

Indian Languages

Some sense of the wide range of cultural differences can be ascertained through the diversity of languages. It is estimated that at the present time, more than 200 different Indian languages are spoken within Indian America. These languages can be grouped into 20 more inclusive "families," in recognition of the relationships that exist between these particular languages. Such a relationship is akin to the sort shared by French, Spanish, and Italian in the Romance language family. The most common linguistic "families" include:

1) Eskimo.* Spoken along the Arctic coast and immediately adjacent islands of Greenland, Canada, and Alaska. It was believed

*The wording of these descriptions was originally prepared by the project director as part of his essay on American Indian Languages published in Ferguson and Heath, eds. Languages in the U.S.A. (Cambridge University Press), in press.

formerly that this family consisted solely of two very closely related languages, one in western Alaska, and the other in the remainder of the Arctic area. More intensive research, sponsored in the main by the Alaska Native Language Center at the University of Alaska, has now shown that there may be as many as five distinctive Eskimo languages spoken in Alaska alone. Here, as elsewhere in this list, the level of fluency is not uniform across the given area. Thus while Eskimo remains the first language of persons in rural Alaska ("the bush"), regardless of age level, larger settlements (e.g., Bethel) and urban areas within the state, reports are that many of the children entering school for the first time are not fluent in Eskimo.

2) Aleut. Spoken in the Aleutian island chain which extends off the southwestern corner of Alaska separating the Bering Sea from the Pacific Ocean. Aleut and Eskimo languages are believed by some to comprise a larger, more inclusive super-family, although the similarities could be due to close historical contacts between peoples and not to common linguistic origins. Archaeological settlements in the Aleutian Islands do appear to pre-date the earliest evidenced Eskimoan settlements by several thousand years.

3) Tlingit and Haida. Spoken along the coast and adjacent islands of southern Alaska and northwest corner of British Columbia. Speakers' tradition reports that both Tlingit and Haida are distantly related to the various Athabaskan languages of interior Alaska and, by extension, to Navajo and Apache languages in the southwest United States. (See 5

below). Even if this is true, such great time depth has transpired that each language deserves its own treatment in this listing.

4) Wakashan. Spoken on Vancouver Island and the adjacent coastal mainland of British Columbia Nootka and Kwakiutl are the more familiar Canadian members of this family. Makah, the ancestral language of Neah Bay and surrounding areas on the northwest corner of Washington's Olympic peninsula, is the only Wakashan language spoken on the U.S. mainland.

5) Athabaskan. Spoken within an enormous area of the interior of Alaska and western Canada (e.g., Kuchin, Eyak), in scattered sections of Washington, Oregon, and northern California (Hupa, Tolowa), and in large sections of the U.S. Southwest (Navajo and the several Apache languages). Many of the Athabaskan languages have been the focus of intensive analysis by linguists and anthropologists. Practical benefits have been evidenced in many instances. A writing system is available for use by Hupa speakers, for example, which gives a unique symbol for each of the contrastive sounds of the spoken language. This system departs in significant ways from the alphabetical principles and spelling conventions common to American English where a number of letters and groups of letters can represent the same sound. The distinctive "Indian" quality can be associated with written Hupa and the written language is said to have become a point of pride for many members of the tribe because of it.

Navajo is the most widely spoken of the Athabaskan languages, primarily because the Navajo nation is the largest single tribal entity in America (by some estimates, in fact, there may be more speakers of the Navajo language than there are of all other American Indian languages

combined) Even though English fluency continues to expand within the tribal membership, Navajo has remained the language of the home and the language preferred for communication for most persons on the reservation. Navajo is also the only native American language which has had a commercially-prepared typewriter keyboard designed especially for its speakers' use.

6) Salish. Spoken in southern British Columbia and the Puget Sound area, though related languages also extended across northern Washington state, northern Idaho, and into western Montana. American members of the Salish family include: Lummi, Quinault, upper and lower Chehalis, Okanagon, Lake, and other Salish languages on the Colville reservation, Spokane, Kallspel, Coeur d'Alene, Kutenai, and Flathead. In most cases, fluency in these languages has been retained only within the older segments of each reservation's speech community, though persons in many families can still be found to use descriptive phrases and idioms particular to their tribe's ancestral language during daily English conversations.

7) Penutian. Spoken in the USA, primarily in California (e.g., Yukots, Miwok, Maidu) and in Oregon (Klamath, Upper and Lower Chinook). While most speakers of Tsimshian are found in British Columbia, some Tsimshian speakers live in southern Alaska as well.

8) Sahaptin. Fifteen or more dialects spoken on the Yakima reservation and the Sahaptin portion of the Indian speech community on the Colville reservation in Washington state; other Sahaptin dialects are spoken on the Warm Springs and Umatilla reservations in Oregon and by the

Nez Perce in Idaho. Sahaptin itself is often classified as a unit within the Penutian language family on the evidence of a historical relationship which is based on linguistic comparisons. On the other hand, an extreme amount of inter-community intelligibility still sets Sahaptin apart from the other Penutian languages. This aggregate autonomy has been recognized by the Sahaptin speakers themselves. One consequence of this has been a three-state, five-tribe Sahaptin Language Consortium, established in 1976 to assist member tribes in addressing their common interests in Sahaptin language maintenance and cultural retention. For these reasons, separate status is given to Sahaptin in this listing.

9) Hokan. Spoken in the west and southwest, the Hokan grouping is composed of a large number of diverse languages, including Karok, Shasta, Pomo, and Washo (in California) as well as Hualapai, Huvasupai, Mohave, Diegueno, and other Yuman languages of Arizona, southern California, and northern Mexico. The rural location of many of the Hokan speech communities has helped retain ancestral language fluency into the twentieth century. Recent ties of cooperation between dedicated linguists and trained native speakers have resulted in highly successful, tribally-based language maintenance projects accompanied by significant advances in linguistic scholarship as well.

10) Uto-Aztecan. Spoken on both sides of America's southern border, only half of the languages in this family are native to the United States. The grouping includes Luiseno, Serrano, and other languages of southern California, and Hopi languages spoken within the cluster of mesa-topped villages which constitute the pueblo of Hopi in

northern Arizona. This group also includes Pima and Papago, spoken in southern Arizona and northern Sonora. A number of languages whose speakers were traditionally found within or near the Great Basin (Mono, Paiute, Shoshone, Ute, Chemehuevi) and Comanche, one of the languages of the southern Plains states, are also part of this linguistic aggregate. Yaqui, formerly spoken only in Mexico, is now spoken in southern Arizona, primarily within the area called Pascua, a barrio of metropolitan Tucson.

Recent missionary-based efforts at language research have assisted in the maintenance of Uto-Aztecan fluency in some instances, especially within southern Arizona. Other Uto-Aztecan tribes remain strongly traditional and have resisted efforts toward cultural assimilation throughout their contact history. These factors, along with the rural location of many of these speakers' homesteads, have facilitated a continuity in native language expression still evidenced within most of the communities to this day.

11) Kiowa-Tanoan. Spoken in the southern Plains states and the southwest, this family includes Kiowa, one of the languages of the southern Plains, as well as Tiwa, Tewa, and Towa, three of the six languages spoken among the pueblos in the southwest. Traditionally, the Tanoan languages were associated with Rio Grande pueblo communities. But during the aftermath of the Pueblo Indian revolt of 1680, a group of Tewa speakers moved from their home in central New Mexico, to set up a colony on the second mesa of Hopi pueblo, Arizona. Today, members of that colony are often fluent in both Tewa and Hopi (and in English and Spanish as well). Many anthropologists are said to have obtained their "authentic

information" about traditional Hopi culture from persons of Tewa background so that distinctions between the two groups sometimes become blurred in social science accounts.

12) Zuni. Spoken at the pueblo of the same name in western New Mexico. Zuni is a single language and may be related to the languages of the Penutian family (number 7, above), but the time-depth associated with that relationship suggests that Zuni people have had their own autonomous cultural history for a considerable period of time.

13) Keresan. Spoken within seven of the pueblo communities of central New Mexico: Acoma, Laguna, Santa Ana, Zia, San Felipe, Cochiti, and Santo Domingo. As may be the case for Zuni, Keresan can be termed a linguistic isolate, meaning that the close relationships with other languages common to the region cannot be readily demonstrated. But in this case, the totally unique structure of Keresan grammar makes it unrelatable to any other language in native North America. And even if it were relatable, the connection would lie at so great a time-depth as to make the fact inconsequential for historical analysis. This implies that Keresan speakers may have been among the first (or at least the earliest of the currently known) inhabitants of the puebloan southwest, a fact receiving increasing support from recent archaeological research in the area.

14) Siouan. Spoken primarily in the Plains areas at the time of European contact, this family constitutes a large grouping of languages. Several internal divisions within the family are recognized. These include Ponca, Quapaw, Omaha, and Osage (in Arkansas and the southern

Plains), Winnebago (Wisconsin, and now Nebraska as well), Mandan, Hidatsa, and Crow (in the northern Plains) and the three commonly identified "Sioux" languages, Dakota, Lakota, and Nakota (Minnesota, Montana, and North and South Dakota). Members of the Siouan family were also located in the lower Mississippi Valley (Biloxi, Ofo) in the Carolinas (Santee, Catawba) and in Virginia (Tutelo). Most analyses now accept the historical relationship between Siouan, Iroquoian (number 17 below), and Caddoan (number 15), though a Siouan-specific period of internal language divergence is also accepted by those scholars.

15) Caddoan. Originally spoken in southwestern Louisiana and Eastern Texas (Caddo proper), speakers of what became known as Arikara, Pawnee, and Wichita appear to have moved onto the Plains, where they were at the time of European contact. Today, Arikara speakers are found on Fort Berthold reservation in North Dakota; the other languages of the Caddoan family are spoken in Oklahoma. Ancestral language fluency is not extensive within any of these given contexts though Fort Berthold Arikaras are now involved in a language maintenance effort involving three Indian languages (Arikara, Mandan, and Hidatsa) to correct the situation within that community.

16) Muskogean. Spoken in the southeastern United States, these languages appear to have been members of the largest language family there. The remaining languages in that area, other than the members of the Siouan family, are commonly viewed as language isolates. Familiar members of this family include Creek, Choctaw, Alabama, Koasati, Seminole, and Miccosukee. Attempts were made to remove the Muskogean-speaking

tribes into "Indian country" during the 1830's. The diverse locations of their descendents today attest to the partial effectiveness of that policy: Choctaw speakers are found in Mississippi, and Eastern Oklahoma, Creek speakers in Florida, Alabama, Texas, and Oklahoma, and Seminole speakers in south-central Florida and Oklahoma.

During the early years of the nineteenth century, Protestant missionaries administered schooling programs serving the Muskogean tribes. In those schools, children's ancestral languages played critical roles in the instructional process. The long-standing tradition of Choctaw language literacy, which continues within the Mississippi and Oklahoma communities to this day, has been only one of the by-products of those efforts.

17) Iroquoian. Originally spoken in the southern Great Lakes region, this family includes Huron and the languages of the League of the Iroquois such as Seneca, Cayuga, Onondaga, Oneida, and Mohawk, as well as Tuscarora and Cherokee, originally spoken in North Carolina and Virginia. Tuscarora speakers moved to the southern Great Lakes region and were admitted to the League around 1715. A major portion of the Oneida tribe was removed to Wisconsin in the nineteenth century. Senecas, Cayugas, and Wyandots were relocated from New York state to Oklahoma. Such also became the case for many of the Cherokees. The development of the Cherokee syllabary by Sequoyah and its acceptance and use by Cherokee people as a whole may have contributed greatly to the retention of Cherokee language fluency in spite of the "trail of tears." To ths day children in some sections of Oklahoma often enter school with Cherokee, not English, as

their first language. The flourishing continuation of the Longhouse religion in Iroquois communities in New York state may likewise have assisted in the retention of ancestral language fluencies in those contexts.

18) Algonquian. Spoken in a widespread geographic area during both the precontact period and at the present time. Algonquian languages originally spoken in the northeastern states include Cree, Micmac, Passamaquoddy, Shawnee, and Deleware. Chippewa, Menominee, and Potowatomi were spoken by Algonquian tribes in Wisconsin and Ojibwe by tribes in Minnesota and Michigan. Speakers of Shawnee and Delaware were subsequently moved into Oklahoma where fluency is evidenced primarily within the older segments of the communities. Fluency level for other Northeastern and Great Lakes Algonquian languages is not so critical, but only in the exceptional cases (e.g., Red Lake, Minnesota) is the language known by the majority of community membership.

In the pre- and early-contact periods, Cheyenne, Arapaho, and Kickapoo-speaking tribes moved out of the Great Lakes region and onto the Plains. Speakers of Blackfoot (Siksika) may have done likewise but at an earlier point in time. Today these Tribes have been settled on reservation lands in various states, the Cheyenne-speaking Tribes in eastern Montana and Oklahoma, the Arapaho in Wyoming, Kansas and Oklahoma, and the Kickapoo in western Montana. Fluency varies from household to household within each tribe. Some speakers of Kickapoo are also found in northern Mexico where it is not uncommon to find families maintaining trilingual fluency in English, Spanish, and Kickapoo.

Additional, and more temporally remote, connections have also been posited to link the Algonquian language family with the Ritawan languages of California (Yurok and now extinct Wiyot) and with the languages of the Wakashan family discussed earlier.

To this list could then be added a series of additional language families and single-language isolates, many of which are no longer used in conversational speech and may only be remembered in the form of single words, phrases or idiomatic expressions. Those, plus the indication of languages for whom no records, speakers, or descendents of speakers now exist, suggest that at the time of the European contact with America, as many as 400 different languages could have been spoken by the various members of the nation's aboriginal population. This gives a minimum of 400 different cultural traditions, each with its own history, its own economic and social patterns, its own cosmology, and its own value system, which may have been created, developed, and maintained by the native inhabitants of North America.

Recent Counts of Indian Languages

The most recent attempt to determine how many Indian languages are still being spoken throughout Indian America, as well as how many persons speak any one of these languages, was made by in Chafe (1962). Information on actual spoken Indian languages was obtained by mailing a simple questionnaire to "over five hundred persons, about half of whom were able and kind enough to respond. Respondents included anthropologists of varied specialities, teachers, government administrators, members of the language groups in question, and

informed bystanders" (Chafe 1962, p. 62). Comparisons of the data for each language reveal several interesting facts about Indian language fluency in America at that time. According to the responses to the survey, approximately 200 different Indian languages are still being spoken within the United States. Yet not all languages exist at the same, or even at a comparable, "level of fluency." Chafe's data were compiled in terms of total number of speakers and age-range of speakers. Tabulating the data in terms of the two variables yields the following matrix:

Table 2: Number and Age - Range of Speakers of Indian Languages.

for language with	fluent speakers are predominately Over 50	over 20	all ages
less than 10 speakers	49	0	0
10 - 100 speakers	24	7	2
100 - 1,000 speakers	6	29	38
1,000 - 10,000 speakers	0	6	39
over 10,000 speakers	0	0	6

The apparent relationship between number of speakers and age-range of speakers is clear: The larger the number of speakers, the wider the age-range into which they fall.

Chafe's analysis does not explain why some languages have come to have so few speakers, and why other languages have retained so many speakers. Until recently, however, few attempts had been made to clarify site-specific dimensions of the data or to relate these dimensions to the

larger social realities. However, a series of household surveys, including those carried out in Wisconsin's Indian communities during the spring and summer of 1978 (Leap, 1979) and reservation-wide language surveys among the Uintah-Ouray tribe of Ute Indians in 1979, (Phillips, 1980) and the Makah tribe in 1980, (Renker, 1980) added to the handful of tribe-specific language surveys carried out before this time and now have begun to provide a data base against which some of those larger realities can be identified.

English and Indian Language Fluency

The initial impression from a review of these data suggest that for many persons the level of Indian language fluency is directly dependent on the level of English language fluency. Persons who are reported to speak their ancestral language fluently are generally the persons who are also reported to be the most fluent in English. That generationally-related factors are at work here can also be surmised from the data: The correlation between English and Indian language fluency is most apparent within the members of the reservation community currently enrolled in elementary and secondary schooling programs. Additional factors, likewise, have had a hand in affecting the relative level of a person's Indian language fluency. Family size is one such factor. In some contexts, the larger the family, and especially the presence of grandparents within the home, the higher the tendency of the student to speak the Indian language. In other contexts, smaller family size favors the retention of Indian fluency.

In still other contexts, family size appears to be irrelevant to the rentention question.

There is, likewise, no assurance that even persons from the same generational grouping, or even the same age-level, will necessarily evidence the same, or even comparable, patterns of language fluency within a given speech community. An earlier study of issues in Cherokee education (Wax, 1973) reported the following breakdown of English and Cherokee language fluency patterning among 158 Cherokee students entering school for the first time:

Table 3: English and Cherokee Language Fluency Patterns Among Cherokee Students.

English only	12	7.6%
English and Cherokee (bilingual)	42	26.6%
Cherokee and "a little bit of English"	29	18.4%
Cherokee only	61	38.6%
No response	14	8.9%

Of the 158 students interviewed, 132 were reported to be fluent in their ancestral language while only a third (34%) of those students were fluent in English. Such a statement, while supported by the data, masks the fact that for some of these students English is very much an equal means of communication. For others, English is hardly known or used at all.

The particular breakdown is significant when compared to Indian and English fluency patterning identified through the Northern Ute reservation

survey (Phillips, 1980, p. 72). Here, in the sense noted above, speaker level of Indian language fluency is more directly dependent on the level of English language fluency. Students who speak Ute language very well are reported to speak English very well also while students who speak little or no Ute show a much wider range of relative English proficiency. The full display is shown in the following table:

Table 4: English and Ute Language Fluency Among Northern Ute Students.

		English Language Proficiency			
		very well	well	adequately	little
Ute language fluency	very well	5	0	0	0
	well	4	0	0	0
	adequate	6	0	0	0
	just a little	27	14	4	0
	none	18	14	8	0

When the data in Phillips' study are arranged in terms of the Cherokee-oriented fluency patterns, paralleling Wax's framework, some of the site-specific contrasts are noticeable--especially since the Ute students who are proficient in English, but know only a "little" Ute, have no place in the Cherokee-modeled array:

Table 5: English-Oriented Fluency Patterns Among Ute-Speaking Students.

English only	40
English and Ute ("bilingual")	15
Ute and "a little bit of English"	0
Ute only	0

Such contrasts between the Indian language fluency patterns exhibited by different Indian Tribes need to be investigated in greater detail. Explanations for many of the conditions of "language decline," "language loss," and "language retention" which are only hinted at in Chafe's article will emerge from such analyses. Unfortunately, site-specific studies of Indian-language fluency patterns have yet to be developed for the majority of the nation's Indian languages.

Bilingual Education Needs

There is a lack of data even where more global perspectives on numbers of speakers of Indian languges are concerned, especially as those figures overlap with speaker's English language proficiency and school-related language performance. There has been only one attempt to develop a perspective on such relationships. A survey of BIA schools and public schools receiving support under the BIA's Johnson-O'Malley program was designed to determine how many Indian students in those schools evidenced "bilingual education needs" and how many of these required, but were not receiving, bilingual education instruction (The National Indian Training and Research Center, 1975).

The study defined "bilingual education needs" in the following terms:

> An Indian child with a bilingual education need is a child with limited English speaking ability who comes from a home where the Indian (or native) language is the dominant language spoken (NITRC, 1975, p. 4).

The survey found that, of the 169,482 Indian children enrolled in BIA schools or schools receiving JOM funding, some 57,709 students have bilingual education needs. More seriously, the survey found that 42,454, roughly 24% of the total Indian student population and 84% of the segment with bilingual education needs, require but are not yet receiving bilingual instruction within their school.

There is every reason to believe that these figures under-estimate the size of the existing need. The survey instrument did not ask student-specific language fluency questions. Instead, one designated authority at each site was asked to provide a general estimate of the number of bilingual students enrolled at that school and the percent of those who have bilingual needs. Unfortunately, no criteria were given to guide the development of those estimates or to assure that figures from any two sites would (or could) be meaningfully compared. It might be assumed, for that reason, that respondents would identify and tabulate only those students with the most visible language needs. More subtle forms of bilingual fluency, such as instances where the students are proficient in one of the locally appropriate forms of Indian English, might well be overlooked in such a tabulation, given that the child is speaking English. How "silent" Indian children would fare in either regard is equally unclear.

It is no wonder then that a report entitled "Education in the Bureau of Indian Affairs" released two years after the completion of the NITRC study, made the following claim:

> Children enrolled in BIA schools have historically reflected unique and extraordinary needs. These unique and extraordinary needs refer to the culture-language situation wherein most Indian children entering BIA schools continue to be tribal speakers first and speakers of English as a second language next (Benham, 1977, p. 31).

and then concludes with the observation that ". . . about 60% of BIA Indian children could benefit from bilingual education (Benham, 1977, p. 35). Granted, only 30% of all school-aged Indian students are currently enrolled in BIA-operated schools. In many instances these students come from the more isolated rural areas, precisely the environments where ancestral language fluencies would be expected to be widely maintained.

In light of this fact, even adjusting to Benham's obervations does not refute his observation that over half of the students enrolled in BIA schools have retained some control over their tribe's ancestral language. It merely emphasizes, as noted before, that Indian language proficiency remains an issue in Indian education both within the BIA as well outside of it.

Indian Language Factors and Academic Achievement

How bilingual fluency actually affects the outcomes of Indian education in any of the situations is another equally unexplored question. The issue may not be so problematic in instances where the student enters school speaking no English at all, although how many such students enter school each year has not been, and is not being,

determined in any systematic way by state or federal authorities. But in the other instances, particularly where the Wax and Phillips data would suggest might be more commonly the case in an Indian school, problematic issues do abound. There is evidence that students from multi-lingual backgrounds may deal with time-orientation or ethnolinguistically related questions in ways that are different from monolingual English-speaking students. John-Steiner and Osterreich (1975) have likewise identified so-called "learning styles" which, they argue, are characteristic of students from pueblo Indian backgrounds and less characteristic to western-oriented cultural transmission processes. It is still not necessarily clear whether fluency in the Indian language is the cause of any associated behavior or whether Indian language fluency merely transmits certain cultural facts which are themselves the bases of behavior. In addition, it is still unclear whether the level of Indian language fluency prompts an individual student to evidence more, or less, of a particular syndrome or whether cultural influences function totally independently of the students' language skills, thereby making learning styles something other than a language-related issue altogether.

To be sure, aspects of the language factor have been taken into account in numerous studies of Indian educational needs and Indian school-related problems. But a review of such studies reveals that a diversity of conclusions have been drawn about language fluency and its intersection with other dimensions of Indian education. The resulting

picture is far from homogeneous and, in several instances, quite contradictory.

Research and analysis argue, for example, that the development of the Indian student's Indian language skills is critical to his/her psychological well-being and cognitive development (National Committee on Indian Education 1966; Bank Street College of Education 1976). But other studies, e.g., Anderson, Collister, and Ladd (1953), Coombs et al. (1958), Havighurst (1970), and MacLean (1973), argue that Indian language fluency can function just as readily as a barrier to a student's school-related achievement. Coombs et al. (1958) in particular argue in terms of a relationship between student Indian language fluency and student "level" of acculturation, implying that those who have retained their ancestral language skills are those who have absorbed less of the orientation to the western society. This study, however, presents nothing more than data from English language-based standardized tests to support the claim. Auerbach and Fuchs (1970) have made the same association between language retention rate and degree of acculturation, citing the work of the Spindlers (1955, passim) as the basis of support for their claim. Neither of those studies show that Indian language fluency is necessarily a dysfunctional trait, even though they seem to imply that preference of language fluency may predict dysfunctional "tendencies" in other personal domains.

Havighurst (1970) offers a more problematic interpretation of this question. His analysis draws particular parallels between Indian

students and the problems faced by other minority students in the nation's schools, especially those who come from other non-English speaking backgrounds. He argues, however, that the "solutions" to the students' current difficulties will come only after the socioeconomic condition of the students' families are improved and after the parents learn to speak and read English more effectively (Havighurst, 1970, p. 8). School-based uses of student Indian language skills have nothing to do with either of those changes, however, Havighurst specifically omits any discussion on the role ancestral language instruction could play in Indian education.

The Language Issues within Indian Education

Other studies have focused on the contributions which Indian language instruction could make in improving the Indian student's educational experiences. Fuchs and Havighurst's summary of the findings of the National Study of American Indian Education (NSAIE) reports that "... the overwhelming majority of Indian students and parents have positive feelings about their tribal language and culture." (Fuchs and Havighurst, 1972, p. 213). This might imply that tribes would be in favor of integrating Indian language instruction, and thereby the benefits of those "positive feelings," into their students' schooling programs.

Site-specific inquiries, however, have not always confirmed Tribal support for such suggestions Although some interest in the topic was exprienced by individual Indians, Indian parents and community members throughout the state of Minnesota reacted much less favorably to the

idea of school-based Indian language arts instruction. In fact, of all the items so reviewed, bilingual/bicultural education was ranked with the lowest interest level among the parents sampled, while school program innovations relating more closely to traditional, English-oriented, language needs were given a much higher priority in each case. (Minnesota Department of Education, 1976).

The same reaction was revealed in the responses to the NITRC bilingual education needs assessment discussed in the previous sections. When polled, school authorities did note there was interest in bilingual programs but added that there was greater need for program innovations touching on staff development, in-service, and home-school liaison.

Such comments do not refute the observations about Indian interests in language and culture questions as reported by the NSAIE summary. They do, however, remind us that any such attempt to draw "pan-Tribal" generalizations about Indian attititudes in education can only be constructed on a site-by-site, comparative basis. The importance of this argument will be underscored in the following section.

Researchers have also drawn conflicting conclusions when discussing how Indian language instruction can best become integrated into the curriculum of the local school, Tribal attitudes permitting. Some of the participants at the Association on American Indian Affairs Indian Education conference in 1966 who were consulted in the preparation of the BIA's 1974 description of its programs, as well as

many of the field personnel and scholars giving testimony before the Senate Special Subcommittee on Indian Education in 1967, stressed the unique requirements which Indian language instruction makes on a school's curriculum. It is generally recognized that the culturally sensitive nature of the school's involvement in any Indian language-related activity cannot be diminished or down-played at any stage of the program's implementation. Authorities argue that keeping the language program as a self-contained component within the school curriculum may be the most productive way of responding to this situation.

Other scholars are less impressed with the political and cultural needs for program autonomy. Proponents of this position stress that every step of the Indian language program must be planned and coordinated in the light of the school's existing English language arts curriculum. If it does not, they argue, the school runs the risk of imposing English unilaterally on the students during their formative years (Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969) and hence of attacking the student's sense of consistency and self-sufficiency (John-Steiner and Osterreich, 1975). Additionally, there is the danger that the critical faculties of students are prevented from developing in traditional as well as western-oriented terms (Bank Street College of Education, 1976).

Not all Indian education research efforts or discussions of research findings give even this much attention to the specifics of the Indian language question in Indian education. The implications arising

from the absence of attention to the language question are clearly evidenced when the arguments of such studies are reviewed. A set of readings designed to present Montana educators with an introduction to the history, culture, and present-day concerns of American Indian tribes and to stimulate from this basis further sympathetic teacher involvement in Indian education is one such volume edited by Bigart (1972) The first section of the book contains a collection of articles by several scholars well known for their research into issues in Indian education. The language question is discussed, however, at only two points in these essays. McNickle notes that "many Indian students" start school speaking only their native language. Havighurst, in his discussion of the native language instruction issue, merely suggests that the school should set up a bilingual component (details unspecified) in grades K-3, provided the children have already learned the language in the home. The bilingual component could be extended through grades 4-12 as well, if there is enough interest within the community to justify it and sufficient local resource base to support it.

Concerns could be raised about both of these statements. McNickle's statement is nothing more than an overly generalized impression of student language realities and does not assist specific school authorities in how to determine relevant remedies for particular student language needs. Havighurst's recommendations are presented in equally programmatic terms. Pedagogical benefits from such instruction are not explored. School experiences with bilingual education in other

states are not cited. Tribal evaluations as to the classroom benefits and limitations stemming from such programs are not discussed. Only a small facet of the language issue emerges from his discussion.

A similarly "restricted" treatment of the Indian language question and its relationship to Indian education can be seen in Jones' survey of Indian educational needs in the United States, Canada, and Mexico (Jones, 1972). The survey was carried out in order to determine what things must be done to bring about changes in, and to upgrade the quality of, Indian education in America. An historical perspective on Indian education issues is provided, and the language question is discussed in those terms. Jones cites, for example, a government study dating from 1928 which "determined" that language is one of the problems in Indian education (there is no mention that this study was the Meriam report, discussed in Section I of this document and no acknowledgment that the language question was brought in as evidence in support of a more tribally focused educational experience for Indian childrer) The contemporary side of the language-education issue is handled quite differently. Instead of reviewing available data, contacting Indian schools and/or tribal groups directly, Jones (and his wife) visited a series of schools in Switzerland and Great Britain to see how the language question there was handled, since, in Jones' estimation, the diversity of languages in western Europe offers a similar situation to the diversity found within Indian America.

Jackson's review of the "... unique features in education at American Indian schools" (Jackson, 1974) presents an equally restricted

perspective on the language issue. His analysis is based on a review of the available literature and not on site-specific field inquiries. From this review, Jackson comes to see the purpose of Indian education as one designed to facilitate Indian participation in American life. This conclusion appears to be based on his findings that all areas of study in Indian schools are oriented in terms of national, not local level expectations. Language arts programs are no exception to this generalization: Jackson cites one Indian school which reports that the "free and easy use of the English language" is the ultimate goal of its school's communication skills program. Indian schooling programs, Jackson claims will differ from other schooling programs only in that"... the first year of schooling be set aside for the development of oral English" (Jackson, 1974, p. 106).

It is clear from the overall tone of this volume that Jackson is not necessarily endorsing the picture of Indian education which his research has uncovered. It is equally clear that Jackson's inquiry has not led him to consider site-specific forms of adaptation to Indian student language needs, that is, needs which, as has been noted here, are <u>not</u> always ESL in nature and which should <u>not</u> always be addressed through the exclusive use of ESL techniques.

<u>National Study of American Indian Education</u>

Such narrowly defined interpretations of Indian student language needs and school-related responses to them are not motivated by tribe- or site-specific language concerns. They do, however, appear to be influenced by the assumption that Indian student needs can be properly

defined only in terms of dominant society priorities. It can be argued, in fact, that if a discussion begins with such an assumption, Indian student language needs could only be seen in terms of English language-related issues. Such clearly appears to have been the case within the National Study of American Indian Education (NSAIE).

NSAIE was a four-year (1967-70) study that investigated the needs, conditions, and concerns relating to the issue of Indian education in America. The Basic Research Program of the U.S. Office of Education provided the funding for the effort, and Robert J. Havighurst was its director. Thirty federal and public school programs served as the sites for the field-based inquiry and numerous Indian and non-Indian researchers were involved in each stage of the investigation.

Field-report summaries were developed on the inquiries from each of these 30 sites. These were published as "Community Background Reports" at the conclusion of the study in 1970. A review of the site-specific summaries shows, however, that the language-education issue (specifically, the particular language needs of the students in these schools, whether based on Indian and/or English) was not a priority of inquiry. Meaningful attention to the language issue was given in only four of these site responses: Those for Mississippi Choctaw, where students enter school with first-language Choctaw fluency and varying levels of familiarity with English; White Mountain Apache, where the discussion and data-gathering were carried out in the native language (the only instance in the 30-site inquiry where this tactic was employed); Prairie Island Sioux, Minnesota, where few

students have truly effective fluency in the language, even though some "are acquainted with" it; and the Chicago urban area, where a wide range of Indian languages from the midwest, southwest, and eastern tribes jointly comprises the verbal repertoire of the city's "Indian speech community." The language issue is discussed only superficially, or not at all, for the remaining sites which included: Lumbee, North Carolina; Hoopa, California; Pawnee, Oklahoma; Ponca, Oklahoma; Rosebud Sioux, South Dakota; Cheyenne River Sioux, South Dakota; Blackfeet, Montana; Cut Bank, Montana; Shonto, Navajo reservation; Bethel, Alaska; Hopi, Arizona; Neah Bay, Washington; Taholah, Washington; Phoenix Indian School, Arizona; Laguna Pueblo, New Mexico; Papago, Arizona; San Carlos Apache, Arizona Angoon, Alaska; Tuba City, Arizona; Pima, Arizona; Menominee, Wisconsin; and the Saint Paul, Minnesota, and Los Angeles, California urban areas.

The stated aim of the National Study of American Indian Education Project was to:

> *Provide Indian leadership and the officials of governments and non-governmental agencies which serve Indian children with basic information to assist in planning more effectively for the educational needs of the Indian populace;
>
> *Provide governmental agencies with information for arriving at a more adequate basis for the allocation of demonstration and research funds for Indian education . . .
>
> *Systematically draw together, summarize, and evaluate the results of past and current research on Indian education so as to articulate the results of those studies with current and future educational programs and research studies . . .
>
> (Fuchs and Havighurst, 1972, p. 328).

Given these stated goals, the failure of most of the field reports to give specific attention to the role of language in Indian education of social advancement seems curious since it is not based on parent disinterest on the part of parents or students in the Indian language issue. The summation of the overall findings reports that:

> Three-fourths of the students indicated an interest in learning their tribal language, and 68 percent of the parents thought it would be nice or important for the schools to offer instruction in the native language.
>
> (Fuchs and Havighurst, 1972, p. 207).

Other factors, apart from tribal interests, have evidently led to the study's failure to adequately handle the issue of Indian language education. A review of the discussion given to the language question in Fuchs and Havighurst's integrative summary, for instance, sheds light upon this oversight. Indian language issues, per se, are not discussed within the volume, though comments are made about Indian language instruction as one of the approaches to language arts instruction cur- rently evidenced in some Indian schools. "Using linguistic techniques to teach English as a second language" and "bilingual education which employs two languages as the medium of instruction..." are the other two options (Fuchs and Havighurst, 1972, p. 208). It is clear that Fuchs and Havighurst see these latter issues as having greater priority within Indian country. The section on "language and culture" (pp. 206-15) begins with these words:

> No question is receiving more serious attention today in discussions on curriculum than the matter of language instruction for Indian children. As the National Study findings indicate, it is clear that the Indian pupils as well as their parents accept the need to learn and study in English.
>
> (Fuchs and Havighurst, 1972, pp. 206-7).

In spite of the fact that sentences in this same paragraph note that Indian interests in Indian language education is an almost equally pressing priority, all but the final paragraphs of this section focus on English language instruction and the process of developing English language skills for Indian students. The rise in popularity of ESL techniques is then discussed. Bilingual education, as specifically enabled under the terms of Title VII, ESEA, is contrasted with ESL in terms of its demands on materials development, teacher training requirements, and the like. But the specific benefits to be expected from a bilingual program are equated with the benefits stemming from ESL efforts Fuchs and Havighurst see both bilingual education and ESL as strategies leading to a more effective acquisition of English language skills.

Hence, bilingual education, in the terms of this report, becomes something carefully distinguished from Indian language arts instruction, per se. This allows the two possible uses of Indian language instruction within the classroom, (i.e., for transition or maintenance purposes) to be considered seperately. Here, in connection with native language instruction, not bilingual education, the question of tribal concern and sensitivity to school-based Indian language instruction is discussed. But Fuchs and Havighurst's treatment of Tribal sensitivity to language questions, as noted previously, leads to some contradictory conclusions. They argue that some Tribes do not want the school to intrude on Tribal rights to control their own linguistic destinies. They also present data from their field surveys to argue that other Tribes are interested in

seeing greater school involvement in Indian language instruction. No attempt is made to resolve the contradictions or to explain why different Tribes might hold different opinions on this question.

Since Fuchs and Havighurst have focused the chapter on English-related language issues, commentary on the Indian language side of the question may not seem relevant to their interests. At any event, their arguments do not attempt to explore the linkages which can be drawn between Indian language instruction and student achievement gains, cognitive development, and improvement of self-image. The possible interaction between Indian language instruction and other components of the school's curriculum is also not discussed. Indeed, no rationale for the use of Indian language arts instruction as a topic for instruction in its own right is advanced in any part of this report.

If there is one general trend in the treatment given to Indian language education questions by researchers and the reports they generate, it is the trend evidenced in the NSAIE: Conclusive statements about Indian language needs are offered when the language question is treated as a subset of some more inclusive statement of English-oriented educational needs. Outside of that context, research conclusions tend to be more contradictory and much less definitive. This is not to say, Coombs et al. (1958) not withstanding, that research findings present arguments <u>against</u> the development of school-based Indian language arts programs. But it is equally clear that reports on research findings do not necessarily present arguments in support of Indian language arts programs, unless those

programs are offered to Indian students as part of the attempt to strengthen student English proficiency.

Indian Language Instruction and Classroom-Based Research

There is a second trend emerging from a review of the research literature that explores the place of the Indian language question in Indian education. And here, in contrast, the NSAIE stands out as a singularly visible exception to the rule. There seems to be a general failure on the part of Indian language-education researchers to base their conclusions about Indian language education issues on data drawn directly from site-specific observations. Inquiries such as Jones (1972) provide only a small indication as to the nature of this trend. Other examples show an overwhelming preference on the part of Indian educational researchers for the use of indirect measures--standardized tests and literature searches being only two of the approaches--as the basis for hypothesis-testing and problem-solving. Using such techniques virtually guarantees that tribal perspectives will not become integrated into the inquiry, and this is a serious matter in its own right. But the failure of researchers to assess Indian education needs in terms of direct measurement has additional implications as well. While it appears that Indian students may have particular language needs and particular language interests where their schooling experiences are concerned, few studies have gone beyond the most basic generalizations about these concerns, within any particular educational environment, to investigate how specific levels of student language skills interact with specific schooling experiences or whether certain

school responses to such needs and interests result in more meaningful school experiences for these students.

Classroom-based inquiries may hold the key to this issue. If any dimension of the language issue is going to have negative effects on Indian education, some reflection of those effects should become apparent within the classroom environment. Apart from the limited comments made by such studies as Phillips (1972) or as found in the school-oriented monographs of Wolcott (1967) or Rohners (1970), the interaction and communication patterns linking teachers, students and other personnel within the classroom context have yet to be systematically described for any site. There are, in effect, no Indian equivalents of Cicourel et al. (1974) and until there are fuller investigations into the role(s) played by Indian language needs and interests in inhibiting or enriching Indian education, no meaningful directions can be taken in regard to the development of actual programs.

It may be the case, of course, that such Indian oriented ethnographies of communication cannot be attempted within the classroom or outside of it until a broader perspective on the more basic facts relating to Indian language structure has first been constructed. A review of the entries housed in the five-volume Ethnographic Bibliography of North America (Murdock and O'Leary, 1975) will identify few tribes whose languages have not received the attention of some linguist or anthropologist or other at some point. Individual discussions of isolated grammatical phonological facts, however, do not

result in a systematic picture of the sentence formation and sentence interpretation processes controlled by speakers of those languages.

Indian Language Research

In spite of all of the information which has been put in print about Indian languages, the number of truly comprehensive discussions of issues in Indian language syntax remain highly limited. In part, this is due to the fact that Indian language scholars tend to analyze and report on sentence-segments, not sentence-wholes. Such was certainly found to be the case in the papers emerging from the Conference on the Historical and Comparative Assessment of the Languages of Native America, funded by the National Science Foundation and held in conjunction with the Linguistic Society of America's Summer Linguistics Institute in Oswego, New York, 1976 (Campbell and Mithun, eds., 1979). Of the seventeen papers reviewing progress to date in the study of Indian languages belonging to specific language families or specific geographical areas, only one paper--Susan Steele's discussion of Uto-Aztecan languages--explored sentence formation issues in any detail.

The same trend can be seen in other Indian-language oriented publications. Of the 219 articles on Indian languages published in the International Journal of American Linguistics (the prestigious journal of Indian language research) during the period 1961-1980, 60 articles dealt with phonological issues, 31 with problems in language reconstruction (either phonological or lexical in nature), and 28 dealt with morphemic or word-level details. Discussions of Indian

language-specific syntactic processes was the fourth most frequently evidenced topic. A review of the content of the 45 dissertations dealing with Indian language-related themes which were written during the same decade yields the same results: Preparation of a descriptive grammar, usually containing a detailed statement of the phonology along with a discussion of the morphological and lexical forms, was the most frequently selected dissertation theme. The next most popular theme was phonological analysis: Eleven Ph.D. candidates selected that theme. Morphological and syntactic studies were tied for third place with four dissertations developing topics under each of those general themes. Apparently, then, the topical skewing toward phonology and morphemic analysis and away from sentence formation questions has not only been, but continues to be, part of the orientation of professional linguistics interests in Indian language description.

Of course it cannot be disputed that scholars need to understand the phonological and word-level processes in operation within particular languages, especially languages for which there are not fluent, native speakers, before they can undertake meaningful interpreparations of underlying syntactic processes and their role in sentence formation. Part of the predominance of discussion of these themes in the literature may be explained in such "functional" terms. But the fact of the matter is, Indian language scholars have often tended to remain intrigued with phonological and word-level grammatical processes long after the basic descriptive facts have been clarified. Frequently, this has led them to delay the attempt to systematize their

sense of the language's sentence formation processes until some undetermined time when the phonological and word-class data have been "more fully" understood. Preparation of detailed dictionaries can also be delayed by resorting to similar, logically based, evasions.

Perhaps this is the reason why so few studies provide detailed discussions of Indian communicative competence skills within any speaking domain. Discussions such as Basso (1970) on the use of silence as a communication modality in Western Apache speech communities, Darnell (1974) and Foster (1974) describing the constraints governing Indian Language narrative and rhetorical form, and Greenfield (1973) on the intersection of Indian religious interests and sound change processes hint at the richness of information which could be expected to emerge from more comprehensive treatments of Indian speaker knowledge and use of speaker skill. But the number of Indian language traditions included within such studies remains small. That number cannot increase until the syntactic processes controlled by fluent speakers of a larger number of Indian languages have first been fully explored. Without such information, it will not be possible to describe how cultural and social constraints affect sentence formation within Indian-oriented "speech-events" except in the most superficial terms.

It goes without saying that objections would be raised by many tribal groups regarding both the fact of such inquiries and the publication of the outcomes. Tribal concerns on such matters always need to be respected. But the existence of such concerns in no way

minimizes the important contributions to educational problem-solving which can be made by comprehensive descriptions of Indian language sentence formation processes and of the limitations which enable transformation of these sentence formation skills into true Indian language fluency. The interplay between Indian language proficiency and school achievement cannot be accurately assessed until the nature of the students' Indian language proficiency itself is understood.

Indian English

How Indian English proficiency ties into these issues is another matter entirely. It is true that an accurate picture of Indian language-related components of the Indian students' classroom experiences are equally missing from the available literature. But (and perhaps more critically) so are accurate pictures of the kinds of English language skills which Indian students utilize for in-class communication. There are detailed descriptions of the non-standard "Indian English" varieties used by persons from one tribal group (cf. Leap, et al., 1977, Leap, 1978, and Leap, 1980a) and some correlations between surface-level phonological process and morphemic details and reading miscues evidenced by students from two other Indian communities (Wolfram, Christian, Leap, and Potter, 1979). Preliminary studies of Indian English features used in as many as 30 tribal and community contexts have been completed or are now well under way. Correlations between spoken Indian English forms and speaker "world view" have been demonstrated by Ron and Suzy Scollen's studies of "bush consciousness" in the Canadian and Alaskan north (see, for example, Scollen, 1977).

These, however, are only topically-specific studies. A clear picture of the range of codes, which Indian English or "lects" within any one speaking community in its generic sense may contain, has yet to be fully obtained. Such information is needed to help clarify the full range of language skills which Indian students could bring with them when entering the schoolroom for the first time; similarly, such information can help identify the particular kinds of English language skills which may arise as by-products of these students' in-school experiences (Leap, 1978). Previous studies which deal with these phenomena in terms of surface-level phonological deletions or area-wide morphological diffusions (Cook, 1973 passim) serve only to mask the problem and diffuse the reality. Cummins' attempts (n.d.) to link such English codes to the fact that the students' verbal skills remain below some "threshold of linguistic competence" is equally misleading, as Burnaby (1980) and Leap (1980b) have demonstrated.

Given the specific Indian language base which accompanies every Indian English code, there are as many "Indian Englishes" as there are American Indian languages; hence, there could be as many varieties of American Indian English as there are varieties of American Indian languages. Until the full dimensions of both of these domains of "Indian language skill" within tribal speech communities are clarified through systematic, careful, site-specific research, the scores obtained by Indian students on standardized English-language arts achievement tests, as well as the factors giving rise to the particular "language problems" these tests appear to identify, will remain subject

to speculation and uninformed debate. The Indian child thus remains a victim of this informational gap.

Summary

Overall, current perspectives on the language issue in Indian education seem inconsistently developed both in scope and in detail. There are impressionistic estimates of the numbers of persons who speak Indian languages, but few site-specific studies to identify the numbers of speakers, and their levels of proficiency, for particular languages. The few studies which exist demonstrate the amount of inter-site contrasts which can characterize and distinguish any two language communities in this regard. There are studies of the ways in which Indian language and English language fluencies interact with the whole range of the students' educational experiences, but, again, few attempts have been made to clarify the full detail of those interactions within specific school and classroom arenas.

There have been other occasions where such studies could have been made and where studies could have explored the potential uses of Indian language as media of instruction. The point is that this and the other connections which can be drawn between Indian language proficiency and Indian education have simply not been widely explored by scholars who are in positions to do so. This omission has for implications for long-range development of Indian bilingual programs. Consider in this regard Barbara Burnaby's recently published study, Languages and their Roles in Educating Native Children (Burnaby, 1980). Her literature search revealed a wide range of essays on language-related themes, some

of which have Indian foci and others not. A tabulation of the references shows, however, that Indian-focused sources predominate only on topics most closely linked to Indian language issues, e.g., sources discussing Indian language orthographies, describing Indian language phonologies and grammars, detailing estimates of speakers of Indian languages, and outlining tribal priorities in education. The sources dealing with the more technical sides of the language-education question, and especially studies citing evidence in support of the use of bilingual education as an educational strategy for language minority students, are almost exclusively non-Indian in focus. Burnaby has to rely on the lessons learned from French-Canadian and immigrant language education programs to provide the basis for, and examples of, the kind of language program her analysis ultimately seeks to advance. That non-Indian program models would be required to demonstrate possible directions for Indian-related language may seem in the best interests of all parties concerned. Still, the argument can be made that there have been sufficient numbers of Indian language projects to allow comparison and contrast of program options in strictly Indian terms. The fact that research on Indian language education cannot yet be based on Indian models represents a telling indictment of the inadequacy of current research into Indian languages and their impact on the Indian student's educational experiences.

There is one new direction which may bring about changes, especially where the more technical dimensions of the research are concerned: An increasing number of native speakers of Indian languages

are pursuing training (and, in some cases, professional careers) in linguistics-related fields. American Indian oriented graduate programs in linguistics have been developed at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and at the University of Arizona; the University of Victoria and the University of British Columbia have operated programs on the Canadian side for several years as well. Less formalized summer workshops and training programs have laid the groundwork for further Indian participation in graduate programs. These programs include the Dine Bi'Olta language workshops held on the Navajo reservation in the early 1970's and the program for American Indians held at the Linguistic Society of America's Summer Institute, University of New Mexico, in 1980, the continuing program sponsored by the Native American Linguistics Institute in conjunction with the Summer Institute of Linguistics. Such programs have fulfilled a second important function by bringing technical training in formal and applied linguistics to tribal members who might otherwise not have the time, resources, or the personal freedom to develop skills in these areas. Numerous tribally based and tribally sponsored workshop programs, offered in conjunction with museum, community center, school, or other educational efforts, are working to these same ends as well.

It is already clear from the work done by Laverne M. Jeanne on Hopi subordinate clause constructions, for example, that the insights of fluent speakers of Indian languages generate interpretations of syntactic structures quite distinct from the interpretations advanced by non-Indian scholars in previous years. Jeanne's work and that of

Perkins and Platero for Navajo, Alvarez for Papago, and White Eagle for Winnebago, jointly suggest the important advances which the increase in native speaking language scientists will engender. Whether native scholars will move their analytical interests into areas of pragmatics, semantics, and ethnography of communication remains to be seen.

CHAPTER IV: LOCAL RESPONSE TO LANGUAGE NEEDS IN INDIAN EDUCATION

The idea that schooling programs made available to American Indian students should in some way address the particular language needs of those students is a long-standing idea in the history of American Indian education. Szasz (1974) notes that the first schools run for Indians by the Spanish and French missionaries during the colonial period operated in terms of an implicit language policy which used the learning of Latin and Greek as well as the colonial language as a basic component of the student's whole educational experience. Similarly, as noted in Chapter I of this survey, the Choctaw, Cherokee, and other Eastern tribes included instruction in their ancestral languages within the curriculum of their tribally operated school programs before the time of their forced resettlement in Oklahoma. The boarding schools which arose in the west in the latter part of the 19th century established an "English only" educational policy which carried over into the on-reservation day schools of the 20th century. The increase in emphasis for local community self-sufficiency made the classroom-based development of student English language skills an equally increasing priority in the years after the publication of the Meriam report. However, as Szasz also notes, providing instruction to students in Indian language arts was not necessarily alien to these classrooms. Writing systems and reading materials were developed under the auspices of BIA for Navajo, Hopi, and Lakota languages at various points during this time period.

From the late 19th century and continuing into the last decade, however, it was still common to find English language arts, either preceded by or coordinated with ESL instruction, as the sole focus of the language arts component of the school curriculum. For students enrolled in public schools (the number of Indian students has increased over this period while the number in BIA schools has proportionately declined) there was little offered other than English instruction. Since BIA schools were designed to prepare students for public school instruction, the same constraints applied, but with greater force. Stories abound regarding the lengths to which school personnel would go to enforce the development of student English skills, often at the expense of student retention of his/her ancestral language. These stories also often attest to the ingenuity and resilience of Indian students who were able to survive these influences without making too many compromises with their cultural background.

Federal Support for Local Programs

More recently, schools serving Indian students have begun to respond to student language needs in more flexible terms. This is due in large part to the fact that student language needs are now being defined in terms that are more consistent with the students' existing language skills and overall (tribal as well as dominant society-based) language needs. Some sense of the scope of this change, and the number of schooling programs which have become caught up in it, can be found by looking at the increased uses of opportunities allowed under Title VII, ESEA, as a means of responding to the language needs of Indian

students. In 1968 only 773 Indian children were benefiting from Title VII programs, most of whom were concentrated in specific school sites on the Navajo reservation. The size of that population grew by 1976 to include 32 schools in 13 states, with 27 different Indian language traditions represented in those programs. By 1979 the number of languages had increased to 30, the number of school sites to 55, and the number of states to 16. The amount of funding directed toward those students' language needs has, likewise, risen proportionately. In 1968, $306,000 apportioned for use under Title VII, ESEA, went to Indian schools. By 1976 $3.25 million was similarly directed, and by 1979 the figure was almost twice the 1976 total.

Title VII, ESEA, is not the only federal agency which provides support for local programs responding to Indian language initiatives. A number of other options can be employed if a bilingual education program or an Indian language arts program is to be integrated into the language arts curriculum of a given school. And, of course, the Indian language related effort need not be based within the classroom environment.

Table 6 presents only a partial sample of the kinds of ongoing Indian language arts-related initiatives in Indian country during the 1979 calendar year. The list must be viewed as partial for several reasons. First, only those projects supported by five of the Federal agencies which could provide services to the tribes in language-related areas are listed here. Those agencies are: The National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Office of

Table 6: Sample of Ongoing Indian Language Arts-Related Activities, 1979.

Agency and Program	Applicant	Focus
1. Folk Arts Program, National Endowment for the Arts	American Indian Council on Alcoholism, Milwaukee, WI	Program demonstrating the traditional tribal crafts, dance, music and verbal arts of the Oneida tribe
	Nampsch'ats Community Foundation, Tokeland, WA	To amend a previous grant to record the verbal arts traditions of Shoalwater tribal members
2. Youth Grants, National Endowment for the Humanities	Admiralty Citizen's Council, Angoon, AK	Preserve Tlingit culture through library of language, art, dancing, songs and stories, with classes for Tlingit children
3. Youth Projects, National Endowment for the Humanities	White Mountain Apache Tribe, Whiteriver, AZ	To involve native Apache youth in creating a pictorial and oral record of the White Mountain Apache people
	Ketchikan Indian Corporation Ketchikan, AK	To enable youth in researching the local history, art, traditions and language of the Tlingit, Tlaida and Tsimshian Indians of southeast Alaska
4. Elementary and Secondary Education Program, National Endowment for the Humanities	San Diego State University, San Diego, CA	To conduct two summer workshops to develop programs and curricula and to preserve the Yuman language and culture
5. RES Resources Organization and Improvement, National Endowment for the Humanities	University of California, Berkeley, CA	To provide access to sound recordings in approximately 70 Native American languages held at the language laboratory at the school
	University of Tulsa, Tulsa, OK	Support cataloguing of the university's comprehensive collection of publishing materials about and by Native Americans

Agency and Program	Applicant	Focus
6. Higher Education National Endowment for the Humanities		To film and tape-record representative Northwest tribal ceremonial and musical activity for use in college courses
7. Research Tools and Reference Works, Research Program, National Endowment for the Humanities	University of Colorado, Boulder, CO	To prepare a dictionary of the Gros Ventres dialect of the Arapaho Indian language
	University of Hawaii Manoa, HI	To support the production of bilingual dictionaries for two Salish Indian languages
	Penobscot Indian Nation, ME	To compile and publish a dictionary of Penobscot Indian language
8. Publications, National Endowment for the Humanities	University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, NM	To support publication of a colloquial dictionary of Navajo language by two emminent linguists
9. Ethnic Heritage Program, US Office of Education	Hannaville Tribal Council Wilson, MI	Nah Tah Wahch (Soaring Eagle) Ethnic Heritage Program
	Auburn School District #408 Auburn, WA	Muckleshoot Language and History
10. Office of Indian Education, US Office of Education	San Pasqual Band of Indians California	Bilingual/bicultural program
	Fort Belknap Community Council, Fort Belknap, MT	Bilingual/bicultural program
	Yerington Paiute Tribe, NV	Bilingual/bicultural program
	Barrego Pass School Board Navajo Nation	Bilingual/bicultural program

Agency and Program	Applicant	Focus
	San Juan Pueblo, NM	Bilingual/bicultural program
	Quileute Tribal Council Taholah, WA	Bilingual/bicultural program
11. Office of Bilingual Education, US Office of Education	Anchorage School District Anchorage, AK	Yup'ik - English bilingual education program
	Regional Education Attendance Area no. 6, Dillingham, AK	Yup'ik - English bilingual education program
	Yukon Flats School District Fort Yukon, AK	Gwich'in bilingual education program
	Nome Public School Nome, AK	Inupiat - English bilingual oducation
	St. Mary's School District St. Mary, AK	Yup'ik - English bilingual education
	North Slope Borough School District, Barrow, AK	Inupiat - English bilingual education
	Fairbanks North Star Borough, Fairbanks, AK	Alaskan Native - English bilingual education
	Chinle School District #24 Chinle, AZ	Navajo - English bilingual education
	Chinle Boarding School Many Farms, AZ	Navajo - English bilingual education
	Flagstaff Unified School District, Flagstaff, AZ	Navajo - English bilingual education
	Havasupai Educational Corp. Supai, AZ	Havasupai - English bilingual education

Agency and Program	Applicant	Focus
	Indian Oasis School District #40, Glendale, AZ	Papago - English bilingual education
	Peach Spring School District #8, Peach Spring, AZ	Havasupai, Hualapal - English bilingual education
	Rock Point School, Inc. Chinle, AZ	Navajo - English bilingual education
	Sacaton Public School District Sacaton, AZ	Pima - English bilingual education
	Window Rock School District #8 Fort Defiance, AZ	Navajo - English bilingual education
	Cottonwood Day School Chinle, AZ	Navajo - English bilingual education
	San Simon School Papago Agency San Simon, AZ	Papago - English bilingual education
	Tuba City Unified School Tuba City, AZ	Navajo - English bilingual education
	Modoc Unified School District Alturas, CA	Piaute - English bilingual education
	Oakland Unified School Oakland, CA	Native American - English bilingual education
	Southwest Board of Cooperative Services, Cortez, CO	Navajo - English bilingual education
	BIA-Ahfachkee Day School Seminole Agency, Hollywood, CA	Miccosukee - English bilingual education
	Indian Township School Calais, ME	Passamaquoddy - English bilingual education

Agency and Program	Applicant	Focus
	Baraga Township Schools Baraga, MI	Ojibwe - English bilingual education
	BIA-Choctaw Board of Education Philadelphia, MS	Choctaw - English bilingual education
	Hardin School District 17-H Hardin, MT	Crow - English bilingual education
	Lame Deer Public Schools #6 Lame Deer, MT	Northern Cheyenne - English bilingual education
	Pryor Public Schools Pryor, MT	Crow - English bilingual education
	Pretty Eagle School Board, Inc., St. Xavier, MT	Crow - English bilingual education
	Wyola School District #29 Wyola, MT	Crow - English bilingual education
	Labre Indian School Ashland, MT	Cheyenne, Crow, Cree - English bilingual education
	BIA-Eastern Navajo Agency Crownpoint, NM	Navajo - English bilingual education
	BIA-Northern Pueblos Agency Santa Fe, NM	Tewa - English bilingual education
	BIA-Sky City Community Schools San Fidel, NM	Keresian - English bilingual education
	Bloomfield Municipal Schools Bloomfield, NM	Navajo - English bilingual education
	Jemez Spring Municipal Schools Jemez Pueblo, NM	Keresian, Tewa - English bilingual education

Agency and Program	Applicant	Focus
	Magdalena Municipal Schools Magdalena, NM	Navajo - English bilingual education
	Ramah Navajo School Board, Inc., Ramah, NM	Navajo - English bilingual education
	Sanostee School-BIA Navajo Agency, Sanostee, NM	Navajo - English bilingual education
	Taos Municipal Schools Taos, NM	Tewa - English bilingual education
	Dulce Independent School District, Dulce, NM	Apache, Jicarilla - English bilingual education
	Tularosa Municipal School District #4, Tularosa, NM	Apache - English bilingual education
	East Bloomfield Central School East Bloomfield, NY	Algonkin - English bilingual education
	Rochester City School District Rochester, NY	Mohawk - English bilingual education
	Salamanca City Central School District, Salamanca, NY	Seneca - English bilingual education
	Salmon River Central School District, Ft. Covington, NY	Mohawk - English bilingual education
	BIA-Cherokee Indian Agency Cherokee, NC	Cherokee - English bilingual education
	Greasy School Board of Education, Stilwell, OK	Cherokee - English bilingual education
	Strother Independent School District #14, Seminole, OK	Creek, Seminole - English bilingual education

Agency and Program	Applicant	Focus
	Salina Public Schools #1-16 Salina, OK	Cherokee - English bilingual education
	Talihina Public Schools Talihina, OK	Choctaw - English bilingual education
	Little Wound School Board Kyle, SD	Lakota - English bilingual education
	Sicangua Oyate Ho, Inc. St. Francis, SD	Lakota - English bilingual education
	Rapid City Area Schools 51-4 Rapid City, SD	Lakota - English bilingual education
	Menominee Independent School District, Keshena, WI	Menominee - English bilingual education
	Milwaukee Public Schools Milwaukee, WI	Oneida - English bilingual education
	Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, De Pere, WI	Oneida - English bilingual education
	St. Stephens Indian School Education Assn., St. Stephens NY	Shoshone, Cheyenne (Arapahoe) - English bilingual education

Indian Education, the Ethnic Heritage Program, and the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA). Other USOE programs and agencies providing support for Indian language related purposes such as Head Start, Title I, Basic Skills, and Migrant Education in USOE; CETA in the U.S. Department of Labor, to name only a few, cannot be listed, primarily because the agencies themselves do not keep records of program support indexed in terms of projects that are "ethnic focused." Language projects receiving state-level support (through state-based Endowments for the Humanities and Endowments for the Arts, State Historical Societies and the like), local level support, (including fundings directly drawn from tribal revenues), as well as projects supported by church groups, the foundations, and other private sources, have, likewise, not been included in the listing.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Curiously enough, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is conspicuously missing from this listing. Traditionally, with the exception of the materials development projects noted above, the BIA has not supported bilingual education or native language arts programs either within its schools or within tribal communities. The BIA's Office of Indian Education Policy Manual has yet to include bilingual/native language arts instruction as one of the standards to which BIA educational services must respond. Even when individual BIA officials have been supportive of tribal and other local attempts to deal with the Indian language reality, the restrictions placed on the BIA's annual budget by

higher level authorities, as well as other obstacles, prevent BIA from adopting anything like an aggressive stance on Indian bilingual education that responds to tribal needs and interests. The determination of the solicitor's office, U.S. Department of the Interior, that BIA schools were not exempt from the Lau mandate has done little to encourage BIA's office of Indian Education programs to shift in its position on this issue.

Currently, then, Title VII, ESEA, and Title IV, Indian Education Act, play primary roles in providing financial support for bilingual education programs in BIA schools. The amount of financial benefits these schools can receive, however, under the provisions of Title VII is somewhat restricted. BIA has yet to be extended State Education Agency (SEA) status by the Department of Education. Thus, BIA is also ineligible to receive its fair allocation of SEA-based technical assistance funds and on-site services to the Title VII programs within the schools in its jurisdiction. The "educational block grant" proposals approved by Congress for FY 82 further restrict the amount of educational funding that BIA and its schools will be able to receive from the Department of Education. Under such circumstances, BIA's decision to use its own money for basic program support, and its reluctance to invest its funds in any kind of supplemental instructional effort, is understandable although regretable.

The particular status of BIA support for bilingual education, added to the data contained in Table 6, the listing of agencies for which such data are not available, and the list of agencies operating

at levels and in sectors other than the federal, suggest the complexity in the options potentially available for use by tribes, schools, and other local agencies if responses to Indian student language needs are to be designed. Such a complexity should not be taken in negative terms or viewed as a shortcoming of the present system. While stressing that this should never be used as an excuse for agency inaction, tribes have argued most emphatically that the diversity of needs and realities in Indian country cannot be met by singularly designed service and support mechanisms. This argument was the basis of tribal objections to the Carter administration's attempts to transfer Indian education functions from the Bureau of Indian Affairs into the then proposed Department of Education in 1977 and 1978. Federal policy-makers, surveying the realities of the situation in terms of Indian-based realities, have come to the same conclusions--hence the argument from the federal Interagency Committee on Education, in its report on federal responsibilities in Indian education, to the effect that Indian education does not belong in any one federal agency to the exclusion of all others (Interagency Committee in Education, 1976).

Project Development at the Tribal Level: Educational Needs Assessments

This range in opportunities for support of programs in Indian education means two things where tribal-level project development is concerned. First, in theory, at least, the range of funding options implies that there could be specific sources of support relevant to each facet of a tribe's language needs. That is, if teacher training

and staff development are needed, then support from one agency can be tapped; if the need is for materials development, then support from a second agency can be sought, and so on.

To take the fullest advantage of these possibilities pre-supposes certain conditions on the part of each interested tribal entity. First, each tribe must be familiar with the full range of opportunities for federal support which are available within the system. (Familiarity with sources of support from state and local levels and from the private sector should also have been developed). The tribes must also have thoroughly assessed its language related needs and identified the areas of current educational activity which do,or do not address those needs. Further, the tribe should have obtained the cooperation of the local education agency if the language program is to be housed within the local school. Alternatively, the tribe should have made arrangements to base the program within some other equally accessible location. Tribal members also need to have become sufficiently informed about the problems which could arise if current language conditions remain unaddressed. Indeed, if nothing else, tribal members should have agreed that some form of action, be it tribal, school or otherwise, be undertaken in response to local language conditions.

It cannot be assumed that such conditions have been met in every instance where Indian language education programs have been, or are being, undertaken. It is true that some Tribes have carried out extensive education needs assessments. Not all tribes, however, have

made such formal analyses of their current education conditions. School districts serving Indian children have often been just as negligent in upholding their responsibilities in this area. In most cases, educational needs assessments are carried out only in conjunction with the development of particular proposals seeking funding from particular sources. This means that the decision to seek funding may already have been made (and usually according to criteria not necessarily in line with tribal concerns). Hence, the needs assessment is carried out to confirm the wisdom of the decision rather than to supply the basis for directing it.

Such needs assessment efforts, moreover, are usually hastily designed and equally shallow in focus. Questions are asked which force parents to restate their concerns in terms more consistent with programmatic interests. It is hardly surprising, under the circumstances, to find a low return rate or even outright resistence to any such efforts when undertaken by school districts or tribal authorities. Intensive tribal confusion over the purpose of the language program and outright objection to the program once the funding is secured and the project goes into operation, should not be surprising reactions under these conditions. Such negative responses should <u>not</u> be equated with tribal rejection of the idea of a language effort, however. What is at issue in their objections is the tribe's right to be informed and to be kept informed on matters of policy and practices affecting the lives of all of its members.

Implementing an Indian Language Arts Program

Guaranteeing that all levels of the tribal membership understand the reason behind an Indian language arts program is the first step in the implementation of a successful language education program for Indian students. Such understanding cannot appear unless the Tribal membership has background data necessary for informed decision-making on such matters. Unless steps are undertaken to inform the Tribal membership about the local needs and the options for responding to them, Tribal membership will have only their own perspectives on language needs and their personal experiences with language arts instruction to use as a basis for evaluating such proposals. School-related uses of Indian languages and cultures will prove highly alien to such perspectives, in many instances.

Amy Zaharlick, who was one of the faculty members in the Pueblo Indian Bilingual-Multicultural Teacher Training Program at the University of Albuquerque during the initial years of that program and who remains actively involved in Indian bilingual education issues within that state, comments on this issue in the following terms:*

> One major difference concerns the attitude of the Indian community in regard to the use of their Indian languages and cultures in the schools. Many Indian people consider their language and culture to be very private. Many Indians believe that their identity and sense of security is bound up with their exclusive control over their languages and cultures and they fear giving up that control to outsiders. Experience has taught them that outsiders do not understand them and their ways, and where outsiders have been involved in their culture, they have suffered. Indian people are aware of the academic problems of their children, but they are not

*Dr. Zaharlick's paper was commissioned especially for this study.

> convinced that relinquishing control of their language and culture is the answer. They are not convinced that school personnel can do justice to that which means so much to the Indian people and they are not sure the price which they would have to pay is worth taking such a chance. Many continue to believe that they have survived so well because they have been so closed to outsiders and have maintained such a tight hold on their language and culture. Some Indian people remain open to the possibility of bilingual education, but before they give their backing, they want to be better convinced of its value.

Indian parents also raise other questions about proposed, school-based Indian language arts programs. Zaharlick continues:

> Most Pueblo Indian adults attended schools which maintained a policy of "English Only." These people remember being severely punished for uttering even a single word of Indian on the playground! As parents they have been careful to teach their children English so that their children would not have to suffer as they did in the schools. Now, as adults, they are confused and ask why it is all right for children to speak Indian in the schools. To these people language policy is so arbitrary and transitory that they are hesitant, at best, to stand behind or be supportive of any type of language policy. They have also learned all too well about the transitory nature of the many short-lived, unpredictable, federally-funded programs--here today, gone tomorrow. Many dedicated, commited, Indian people who have experience with some of these programs have learned that hard work and dedication do not necessarily pay off or have the desired effect, for before they can reap the rewards of their labor, financial support is withdrawn, the programs discontinued, and some new program initiated. The cycle repeats itself with the effect that disappointment and discouragement become even more deep-seated (Zaharlick, 1980, pp. 2-3).

Many attempts to survey the perceptions of Indian parents and tribal officials on Indian language-related questions neglect to pay close attention to how these experiences influence the understanding of bilingual education. Contradictory survey responses, such as those reported by the the National Study of American Indian Education (see discussion in the preceeding chapter of this report), need to be interpreted in these terms. Negative interests in Indian language arts

programs can often be seen not as rejections of the need for Indian language arts instruction, but as a statement of concern about the contradictions Tribal members see between earlier educational practices, existing educational options, and proposed program directions.

Some Problems in Indian Language Education: Staffing and Classroom Resources

Indian language education, as currently practiced in school programs serving Indian students, is itself not without apparent contradictions or problems; Zaharlick continues on this point:

> A very serious concern for the bilingual educational programs which do exist today is the extremely high rate of turnover in personnel. Many federally-funded programs are under pressure to hire highly-qualified Indian people in their top ranking positions. Since such people are in high demand and short supply, there tends to be a great deal of rotating of these people from one program to another. Each new program offers an even higher salary for such a person than the last one and few Indian people can resist the temptation to accept the new, higher paying offer. The result is that each of the programs suffer for the most qualified people do not remain long enough with any program to gain the experience that is necessary to effectively meet program goals and needs. A new person can barely keep the program afloat while they are becoming acquainted with program details and problems. With this situation, little progress is made, discouragement sets in, staff members leave for higher paying positions which offer new hope, and the original program is labeled a failure. Again, some solution must be found for this problem so that some experience base can be built up and the programs be given a fair chance to succeed. This need is one which can probably best be met by the sincere commitment of Indian people who fully understand the needs of the various bilingual education programs, thus underscoring again the importance of educating the Indian community about the whole area of bilingual education mentioned above.
>
> Another major problem which Indian bilingual education programs face is the utter lack of resources. An Indian bilingual education teacher in New Mexico can expect to walk into a classroom of students representing a few to many different cultural and linguistic backgrounds and in less than an hour a day (at best) try to teach them using his/her own local Indian dialect. The teacher is handicapped on every level. The teacher has not had an Indian bilingual education teacher as a model to emulate. He or she must try to conduct the class in a language which is foreign in that

context and for which it is not well-suited or adapted. The teacher feels frustrated when he/she tries to give specific classroom instructions such as "erase the blackboard," "use the pencil sharpener," or "turn the page," for there are no comparable lexical items in many of the Indian languages. Attempts at coining such expressions on the spot are artificial, frequently humorous, and certainly disruptive and confusing, as are the frequent misunderstandings due to the different meanings of common vocabulary items and usages in the various dialects. Standard dictionaries or grammars to refer to or teach from do not exist. There is not an established orthography for many of the local Indian languages and few of the orthographies that have been developed, usually by outside linguists, have been accepted and used by the local Indian groups. In this situation it is difficult to imagine how any real teaching/learning can occur.

These problems are not the only ones an Indian bilingual education teacher faces, either. Generally, there are no curriculum guides for the teacher to follow or materials to use for instructional purposes. The walls and environment of the classroom are usually bare or filled with materials which have no reference or relevance to the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the students and so are ineffective for teaching purposes. The Indian teacher must somehow come up with lesson plans and activities for the students for which there are no guidelines or general objectives. These teachers must determine the specific objectives on their own without much help from the institutions of higher education where they have received their degrees in elementary or secondary education, if they were fortunate enough to receive such training and a degree (Zaharlick, 1980, pp. 4-6).

Responses to the Staffing Problem

Individuals involved in teacher training programs have become aware of these problems and have recognized that the course of study in their degree programs must make some provision to help the teacher candidates become prepared to respond to their issues. Yet, in the experience of many Indian educators, the teacher training programs themselves contain some built-in limitations to effective responses in such areas.

Zaharlick comments on the point in the following way:

One of the most critical problems with these university-based programs is that they lack the personnel, Indian or otherwise, to deliver the kinds of courses needed by the Indian teacher trainees.

The great majority of bilingual/multicultural education courses required tend to be delivered within the colleges of education by education personnel, rather than by people who know and understand the Indian languages and cultures. The teacher trainees are given courses in teaching methods and techniques which concentrate upon how to teach, but not what to teach (content courses). General reference is made to the importance of the Indian culture--its beauty and value--but the courses lack the substance of other content-based courses and the specifics of what it is about the Indian culture that is beautiful and valuable. This is not much for teachers to go on. It is all too often assumed that because the students know how to speak an Indian language and have been raised in a pueblo village they know how to teach their culture using their Indian language as the medium of instruction. . . .

Even if Indian teachers are required or encouraged to take classes outside of the colleges of education, what kinds of resources are available to them? Again, the resources are extremely limited. One would be hard pressed to find even one Indian on the faculty in any department who can teach or speak an Indian language. How many professors in any university are qualified to teach about the Indian culture? Very few, if any, even at the larger universities. Indian teacher trainees are thus found taking general courses in history, philosophy, literature, and the social sciences which present their subject matter from the perspective of our dominant culture, with only passing comments about "Indian culture." Most Indian students find these courses of limited value, describing them as being too theoretical to be of much practical value back in the Indian communities. A number of Indian students who have gone through the existing teacher training programs explain that they still do not know how to set up a bilingual program or know what to do in a bilingual education classroom even though they have taken all of the required courses and have received their degrees in education. There is a critical need to seriously evaluate these Indian teacher training programs and make available the kinds of content courses that will be of practical value for Indian teachers.

Indian teacher trainees are also discouraged and disappointed when they are led into courses which profess to teach them to read and write their Indian languages so that they can teach them to their Indian students and develop curriculum guides and instructional materials. Many of these courses are offered by linguists or people who have had some training in linguistics. In most cases the instructors know very little, if anything, about the languages of the Indian students. What frequently happens in these situations is that the students are being taught general linguistics with a few Indian examples thrown in. The students become frustrated when they realize that such courses are too limited to provide them with the kind of training which will allow them to analyze and describe their Indian languages--to make linguists out of them--and are too general and theoretical to allow them to understand much about the structure or how to teach their specific languages. In these cases the teacher trainees have no one to answer their specific questions or to provide

them with the kind of direct information which they desire and need (Zaharlick, 1980, pp. 7-9).

Certification of Indian Teachers

Training more teacher candidates does not automatically solve the staffing problem or the shortage of in-classroom staff experts. The certification question cannot be ignored. Very few states have developed procedures which would lead to the certification of Indian language native speakers as teachers of Indian language and culture. In the instance of California and Minnesota, the certification operates in terms of an "eminence credentialling" strategy. This acknowledges that the candidate's life experiences contribute significantly to his/her expertise as a language instructor. In Minnesota the eminence credentialling strategy was developed at the insistance of tribal and community education authorities, precisely because the curriculum of the state's teacher training programs was not relevant to the needs of prospective teachers of Indian languages. Still, eminence credentialing may require that the candidate enroll for formal training in aspects of language pedagogy if the candidate desires to retain permission to teach in the state's schools for any prolonged period of time. Eminence credentialling, in Indian language education at least, is more commonly a short range, not a long-range, solution to the staff needs of Indian schools.

Not all states have even formalized criteria which will allow "eminent" Indians to be credentialed for school-related purposes. The reluctance of state-level educational authorities to develop criteria leading to the certification of Indian language teachers is not always

an indication of state-level refusal to deal with Indian realities. In some cases (Zaharlick cites New Mexico as one) state-level authorities argue that they are not in a position to set or determine such criteria; tribal authorities are more aware of needs in this area and would have greater expertise in doing so. Minnesota's case shows that tribally based initiatives can be effective toward this end. But to date, only some tribes in a few other states have begun similar initiatives.

Thus, local Indian language programs are usually forced to respond to their staffing needs within a restricted frame of options. Tribal members who have completed teacher training degree programs and have received state-level certification are eagerly sought, and participation in such training programs by other tribal members is encouraged, even recognizing the limitations in the program focus. If such persons are not available, tribal members concerned about the language issue may be invited to come into the classroom on a short-term basis in conjunction with the school's American Indian week, during the weeks preceding Christmas break or other holidays, or at other times, to provide Indian language and culture instruction as an enrichment activity. Funds may be available in the school's Johnson-O'Malley budget, its Title IV-Part A grant, or some other source, to reimburse these persons for their time. The resulting instruction, however, is a short-term initiative and most participants recognize the "stopgap" nature of this attempt to resolve the local language need.

Instructional Aides

Qualified tribal members may also be hired on a more permanent basis as classroom or instructional aides. When this happens, it may be possible to include instruction in Indian language arts as part of each aide's daily responsibilities. There is a political comment being made through this means (the classroom has a "real" teacher for the "real" subjects, and an Indian one for the Indian issues). Students and parents alike will notice the inequity and may react negatively to it. The aides may react for other reasons. Furthermore, few teacher aides are content to assume full-time responsibilities for any area of classroom instruction unless salary scales are adjusted to reflect the fact. But school union rules and budget restrictions are only two of the factors that may prevent that adjustment.

Non-Indians who go to Indian schools to observe Indian language education programs firsthand often come away somewhat overwhelmed at the "chaos" and "lack of coordination and planning" which seem to characterize the programs. There is some measure of truth to these impressions. The language program may well contain personnel who, while not professionally trained in the techniques of language arts instruction, are nevertheless expected to serve as language teachers, curriculum developers, artists, cultural resource persons, counselors, home-school coordinators, and advocates for the program in tribal contexts. In addition, they are expected to assist the certificated teacher when English language instruction is being supplied. All of this is expected in return for a salary based usually at half that of

the certificated school staff, drawn from revenues which are usually supplied by federal grants or other forms of "soft money," and therefore provided under the terms of a nine or ten month contract and which cannot automatically be renewed. The high rate of staff turn-over usually associated with Indian language arts programs is a telling comment on the personal meaning of these facts.

Linguistic Issues

Staffing is not the only issue that needs to be resolved in such instances. As Zaharlick notes, the fact that so little is known about Indian language sentence formation makes it difficult to develop properly sequenced language arts curriculum plans. The absence of available, systematically designed orthographies complicates the development of reading materials, and, consequently, makes the use of written Indian language in any form (teacher lesson plans, bulletin board displays, flash cards, etc.) very difficult. Zaharlick notes that classroom words and phrases, taken for granted in English-speaking environments, become highly problematic when an Indian language environment is being constructed within the school: What, for example, if the tribe's language has no term for blackboard, eraser or Christmas holiday?

Such problems can have equally serious consequences on the content and effectiveness of program activities, even within the most committed of schooling contexts. The lack of materials and resources, the demands on staff time, and the limitations of staff expertise may result in situations where more short-termed and interim solutions to

curriculum planning and course design will be employed. As Zaharlick notes:

> Teachers who find themselves in these situations usually resort to teaching their Indian students how to count in Indian, learning the names of colors, animals, body parts, etc., and having the children work on native arts and crafts projects. These activities are fine, as far as they go, but they cannot or should not be regarded as constituting an effective bilingual education program. These activities are most frequently based upon translation from our English system of classification and may not reflect in any meaningful way the classification systems found in the Indian languages or cultures. These activities also concentrate primarily upon vocabulary rather than upon syntax or more complete meaningful expressions in the Indian languages. Another problem is that these activities are isolated ones which are not components in a larger plan or integrated scheme. For the most part they are used to fill up class time rather than form the building blocks for more sophisticated, advanced lessons which are aimed at reaching some specific educational goals (Zaharlick, 1980, p. 11).

The problem can be seen in another area as well:

> . . . if the staff have not had much training in the development of curriculum and instructional materials, the usual approach is to write little stories about an animal or something relevant to Indian culture in the language of the children. However, no preparation is made to teach the children how to read these materials. Many children show an interest in looking at the pictures in the books, but are frightened by the long, strange-looking words on the page. Again these people have not been trained in the basics of scope and sequence and have not been able to put together an integrated curriculum that can be effectively used in the school program. Since the regular classroom teachers do not know the Indian languages, they cannot use the materials produced by the bilingual staff. Staff members are normally not certified to teach, so they are not able to use the books they have developed to aid in the teaching process (Zaharlick, 1980, pp. 12-13).

Clearly, the decision to establish an Indian language program within a local school involves many more issues than the mere "change of content" of the existing language arts effort. Who will teach, what will be taught, how will the program be funded--these are only three of the

general questions which must be addressed if such local-level responses to Indian student language needs are to be advanced.

Special Costs

It is equally clear that, whatever the decisions about program design, program implementation will involve expenses greatly exceeding the financal costs of existing language arts efforts. New staff will need to be hired and new materials developed. Basic research may be required so that language structures are better understood. A new orthography may be needed or an existing one revised. The services of resource persons must be secured. Many of these efforts must be initiated and often must be completed before language instruction in any meaningful form can begin within the classroom. Start-up and planning expenses often consume much of the budget of the program during its first year of operation-- assuming, of course, that start-up activities can be delayed until the work of the project has officially begun. Indeed, program regulations and tribal sensitivities may require that background details be well in place before that time.

These special expenses, associated with every component of an Indian language education program, cannot be overlooked. School-district and tribal revenues do not always have the flexibility or even the funding levels to assure that these expenses can be offset. This is why Indian language education initiatives are always quite dependent on external sources of financial support, both for the inception and for the continuation of their efforts. This dependency makes Indian language education programs highly vulnerable and highly

unstable educational vertures. Long-range funding for an effort can never be assured from "soft money" sources. Moreover, program regulations require that language projects conform to certain pre-existing expectations about measurement of progress, deadlines, program goals and objectives, and program activities. Securing external funds can mean that the language needs originally motivating the project will become a less significant program priority, especially since conformity to agency demands and not just responses to local needs is required if continuing agency support is to be secured.

Technical Assistance

Locally based language education initiatives are dependent on externally-based support in a second area as well: Technical assistance. Often, local educational programs do not have the staff expertise required if basic questions about program operation are to be addressed. This is usually the case within the more technical areas of language education, e.g., grammatical analysis, curriculum design, but outside expertise may also be required for artistic or culture resource functions as well. Individuals and agencies may often be willing to provide assistance on a short-term basis; longer-termed involvement of individuals and agencies may require that some commitment be made to offset expenses incurred in the effort. Travel costs and other expenses associated with on-site training by the technical assistance staff may prove to be particulary burdensome to program revenues. But the expenses of on-site training must be met and provisions to do this must be made early in the program's operation. Without it the

program's dependency on the external sources of technical assistance will continue, year after year, and the associated drain on the program revenues will continue as well.

Federal Responsibilities in Indian Education

This need for program access to external sources of fiscal and technical assistance raises an additional problem encountered by Tribes and local schools as they try to respond to local language needs. The problem becomes particularly intensified in instances where the language needs of a federally-recognized tribe are at issue.

The "dual citizenship" status of the recognized tribes was noted in a preceding section to underscore the fact that members of these tribes are entitled, by treaty and trust agreement, to receive educational services both because of their status as Indians and their status as citizens. This situation can easily lead to misunderstandings on the part of non-Indian authorities who use the dual citizenship issue to argue that "some other agency" has a more valid responsibility to provide services within any given area. The fact of the matter is that under the terms of the treaties and trust agreements the whole federal system stands under obligation to provide those services to which the federally-recognized tribes (by virture of their status as federally-recognized tribes) are entitled. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, given its historical role in supplying services to the Tribes, is still expected to function as a "lead agency" in such efforts. But this does not relieve the numerous programs in the U.S. Department of Education, the National Endowments for the Humanities and

the Arts, or any other federal agency or program, from living up to its responsibilities.

Tribal interactions with outside sources are not, of course, restricted solely to agencies and programs within the federal level. As Taylor has noted:

> Self-governing Indian tribes deal as entities with the Federal Government, with the State or States within whose boundaries they are located and with the private sector as well. Indian individuals, as such, also have relationships with all three in the same manner as other citizens: for example, they are subject to Federal income tax and Selective Service laws, they are subject to exclusive jurisdiction by the Federal courts over enumerated major crimes, and they are entitled to welfare benefits under Federal statutes of general application. In the State, they are subject to the health laws, they pay real property taxes on other than trust property, and are subject to all State laws when they are not on the reservation, and privately, they can enter into contracts and purchase goods like everybody else.
>
> Thus an Indian on a reservation with a tribal government may deal from time to time with four governments: his own tribal government, a nearby local community organized under State law, his State Government, and the Federal Government (Taylor, 1971, p. 3).

A recent study by the Education Commission of the States (1980) has attempted to unscramble some of the complexity in responsibility which is alluded to in Taylor's statement, paying specific attention to the responsibilities of the States where Indian educational services are concerned. The study, at best, draws indefinite conclusions about the relative responsibilities of state vs. federal authorities in Indian education. The fact is, the government-to-government relationship linking the recognized tribes to the federal system does not, in any way, pre-empt or exempt State (or local) authorities from making their contribution to quality in Indian education. But convincing state and local authorities

that they, too, must join in this struggle remains a task which only few tribes have undertaken and even fewer have undertaken successfully.

Summary

All of these factors--the diversity of sources of support for Indian language education activities, the numerous problems with start-up and implementation with which these projects must contend, the need to rely on external sources of revenue to support such projects and the unanswered questions about federal vs. state vs. local responsibilities in all such Indian education endeavors--seem to many parties to present a formidable barrier to any interests Tribes may have in developing Indian language arts efforts within their local school. But here, as in all instance of Indian affairs, Tribes are not without guidance and counsel. Tribes are able to rely on self-determination and consultation principles as the mechanisms to guide them in their attempts to resolve these questions. This means, first, that adequate information must be made available so that the tribal membership can make informed meaningful decisions about their options in language education. This also means that time must be set aside for planning purposes, so that tribal preferences, once defined, can underlie all phases of program implementation. These are the minimal criteria which must be met, if self-determination and consultation principles are to become integrated with local language planning. That such site-specific considerations are integral to program success cannot be disputed. Battiste et al. (1975) comments on

how the outcomes of their ten-site field study will apply to the analysis of any Indian language program:

> The authors of this report visited the ten projects and were struck by how different each project was. In addition to differences in language and culture were a whole host of differences that can best be characterized as forming the context for the project. The interaction of all these factors resulted in projects with quite different problems and quite different goals and approaches to bilingual-bicultural education. Given that an overall goal of bilingual-bicultural education, regardless of the funding agency, is to provide diverse groups of children with meaningful education, then it is reasonable that projects would be very different. In fact, if they were not so different, one might question whether the programs were really using the languages and cultures to best advantage in being responsive to the students they served. The fact that the ten Title VII projects were so different indicates that program officers and others in charge of administering projects in the Division of Bilingual Education under the Office of Education have been flexible in permitting projects to develop to best meet their needs. To the authors of the present report, flexible policy guidelines and reasonableness on the part of program officers have been essential ingredients to the development of projects which are responsive to so many diverse language groups and cultures and operate in such different contexts (Battiste, Bond, and Fagan, 1975, p. 64).

CHAPTER V: DIMENSIONS AND DIRECTIONS

A highly inconsistent, if not outright contradictory, set of trends appears to emerge from this inquiry into Indian language education. Concern about all dimensions of the Indian language question is evidenced within and outside of the tribal communities. A large number of agencies at federal, state, local, and tribal levels are actively sponsoring and otherwise supporting Indian language research and Indian language-education program development within a variety of locales. Increases in such efforts are continually demanded, by scholars, educators, and tribes alike. In no sense, then, is the Indian language issue being ignored within the current scene. And in many ways current conditions represent a significant advance over the situation present as recently as twenty years ago. At the same time some of the most basic issues in program design and implementation, in descriptive research, in tribal responsibilities and rights, in education as in other areas, are being shown or deliberately de-emphasized in favor of less controversial and more secure themes.

We see evidence of this cautiously defined attitude toward Indian languages and Indian language education in several places:

1. The new editor of the International Journal of American Linguistics noted, in his letter to subscribers in September, 1980, that reader responses remain divided (and in some instances, sharply so) over the appropriateness of including articles with practical applications to Indian language education in the journal. Proponents argue that such essays are on the cutting edge of Indian language scholarship; others argue that such essays will take already limited space away from essays which would otherwise discuss more technical language themes.

2. The Division of Education Programs of the National Endowment for the Humanities decided (without Tribal consultation) to restrict its definition of elementary and secondary education solely to programs functioning within school classrooms. Language and culture efforts to be based within the Tribal institutions will not be considered education projects or be eligible to compete for funding under the Divisions of Elementary and Secondary Education programs.

3. The Indian Basic Education Act (Title XI, ESEA) required that the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Office of Indian Education Programs undertake a widespread revision of its educational policies, practices, and standards. While the Task Force drafting the new statement of standard included language which would obligate the BIA to provide language and culture services to all of the Indian students within its schools, higher level authority within the BIA's OIEP substituted wording which called for Indian language instruction only when the students are of limited proficiency in English and only to be offered in coordination with ESL instruction.

4 On two seperate occasions the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, promulgated rules and regulations which defined the responsibilities of school districts receiving federal Education funding toward the nation's "limited English proficient" students. Both sets of rules not only exempt such schools from any responsibility to assist in Indian language renewal for such students, but ignore the possibility that some Indian students may be fluent only in the locally appropriate Indian English variety, thereby not being either "limited English speakers" or "standard English speakers."

5. Twenty-five of the 50 states have significantly visible Indian populations. These 25 states report that some form of Indian-focused bilingual or other special language-education effort is being made available to the tribes within their boundaries. Yet the services and opportunities being made available to the tribes highly inconsistent in focus and design, where these state-specific efforts are compared (see Table 7). Apparently, a uniform role for state-level involvement in Indian language education has yet to emerge.

Table 7: Indian Language-Education Services by State.

	AL	AR	CA	CO	FL	ID	IL	MN	MI	MT	NE	NV	NM	NY	NC	ND	OK	OR	SD	UT	WA	WY
Teacher Cert. (state)	N	N	Y	N	0	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Training	N	Y	0	Y	0	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
Aids	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	0	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Need	Y	Y	N	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State-level Needs Assess. General	N	Y	N	0	0	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Language	Y	N	N	0	0	N	N	Y	0	N	N	Y	0	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Local	Y	Y	N	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	0	0	0	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	0	0	Y
Need	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Proposed	0	0	Y	0	0	N	N	N	0	N	Y	0	Y	Y	N	0	N	N	N	0	N	N
English Proficiency Problem	Y	Y	N	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	0	0	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Indian language effort	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y				Y	Y		Y
Title VII	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	O/N	?	Y
Title IV	Y	Y	Y[a][b]	?	Y[a]	0	Y	Y	0	0	N	Y[b]	Y	Y[a]	Y	N	Y	Y	Y[c][d]	N	?	Y
State Legis.	Y	N	Y	?	0	N	N	Y	0	N	N	0	0	?	Y	N	Y*	N	N	Y	N*	N
IOM	Y	Y	?	?	0	Y	N	0	0	Y	0	N	0	N	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y

= No
= Yes
= No data
= Uncertain
= Not for Indians

6. Numerous Federal agencies suppling language-related services to local school districts could be supporting Indian-focused language-education projects with in those contexts. The number of school districts having such interests and an identification of how many of those interests which are being addressed by federal-level agency efforts cannot be ascertained. Most agencies tabulate service delivery in terms of state, county, and school district boundaries. They do tabulate service delivery in terms of the ethnic groups contained within those domains, but never in tribally-specific terms.

7. The 1980 Household Census included for the first time an opportunity for Indian respondents to indicate their tribal language background in language-specific terms. The tabulation sheet developed by the Smithsonian Institution, however, fails to identify instances where what might be seen as equivalent languages are used by politically autonomous tribal groups residing in different states or by federally and non-federally recognized tribes residing within the same state and "supposedly" sharing the same language tradition. There is, thus, a non-recognition that a large part of the Indian language reality of the 1980's is based specifically in such extra-linguistic considerations.

In general it would appear that, even though various parties throughout the public and private sectors may recognize that the Indian language question is a critical part of Indian education, the significance of that question and the need to respond to it have yet to be explored.

Many of the tribes, faced with such realities, have embarked on strategies which are cautious in design and scope but which, with continuining development of tribal support, can bring about a meaningful enrichment of their children's language skills and of their whole educational experiences. Rosier and Farella (1976) outline the kinds of outcomes which can be obtained when school and tribal communities work jointly to bring about effective changes in Indian language education. Not all tribes have been so fortunate in such deliberations; tragically, members of some tribes are beginning to resign themselves to the eminent

demise of their ancestral language fluency and, with it, the verbal component of the experessive cultures of numerous tribal traditions.

Research Needs in Indian Language Education

It is doubtful that an increase in systematic and coordinated research and development efforts will offset the imbalance of social factors which have placed tribal language and cultures in such vulnerable positions in the first place. It is clear, however, that there are specific research-related tasks which can be undertaken by concerned members of the national language-education research community, provided that the research effort is carried out in ways which will insure that tribes will benefit from the inquiries and tribally based decision-making on language-education questions will play a role in the outcomes.

Several statements over the past few years have attempted to identify some of the major areas and issues which would need to be explored within such a framework. These include:

- Recommendations of the Conference on Priorities in American Indian Language Work (1973)
- Lake Superior Association Working Paper on Native American Language (1976)
- Policy Recommendations: SENABEC Conference, Jackson, Mississippi (1977)
- The panel presentation of Dr. Lee Antell, Indian Education Project Director, Educational Commission of the States, at the 30th annual conference of the Governor's Interstate Indian Council (1979)

Copies of those statements are included as an Appendix to this report. A summary of these research needs is presented here.

I. Basic Descriptive Studies

A. Language-specific studies: A large number of descriptions of Indian language phonology and word morphology are available. The number of studies of Indian language sentence formation processes are much fewer and most of those studies identify sentence surface structures, not the processes which underlie their formation. Sentence formation descriptions are the key to effective understanding of Indian speaker performance skills; clarifications of those processes, for at least one representative language within each of the 20 viable language families in America seems called for. Critiques of those statements by fluent speakers with linguistic training and by untrained community personnel are also required to temper the abstractedness of the observations in terms of community-centered realities.

B. Ethnographies of communication: Truly comprehensive descriptions of the full range of uses to which Indian language fluencies are put within the contemporary tribal communities may be beyond the grasp of the present research community. However, specific situations accessible to non-tribal members and non-fluent speakers, can be identified for such descriptive purposes. The availability of any such description will greatly advance appreciation for the broad range of expertise which is required of speakers of any Indian language regardless of their level of fluency. Appropriate methodologies can be gleaned from studies of comparable issues within non-Indian domains, e.g., Cicourel et al. (1974), Garfinkel (1972, passim). The rigorous methods of inquiry and the formal

constraints of different approaches in regard to the "informants" remain questions deserving separate consideration.

C. Studies of similarities and differences: Traditionally, questions about language convergence and divergence have been explored within the context of language families and/or within specific geographical areas. Hamp's review of present and future prospects in American Indian comparative linguistics (in Campbell and Mithun, 1979) summarizes many of the questions which can yet be asked within that area of inquiry.

Studies of language similarity and difference need not rest exclusively within the traditional, comparative/historical framework. The need for flexibly designed curriculum materials in situations where several "dialects" of the same Indian language or several separate but similar Indian languages are found (to say nothing of the problems faced in the need to develop or refine functional writing systems for such languages), could profit from more quantitative studies of factors governing language "relatability." Dialect-distance studies were undertaken in the early 1960's in an attempt to measure structural "distance" separating languages within the Algonquian, Iroquoian, and Siouan language families. Sherzer (1976) attempted area-focused measures of similar questions, specifically to see if diffusion or other commonly manifest cultural processes could help in the interpretation of Indian language diversities. Computer assisted comparative techniques could greatly advance the scope, quality, and reliability of the same line of inquiry. In some objectively based terms, the similarity in differences

between two Indian languages can then, for instance, be determined. Given, that in many ways the structures of Indian grammars remain only superficially explored, the availability of such comparative insights (and the predictions which can be made on that basis) could become a valuable in-field descriptive tool as well.

D. Language acquisition: The sequences in terms of which children learn how to speak Indian languages remain uncharted and undescribed. There are no parallels to the work of Brown and associates (1970) within any Indian speech community, even though attempts have been made to describe the infant speech and "baby talk" used by the children (and the beliefs about children) within those contexts.

Since distinctively non-Western languages are being acquired in these cases, closer studies of the acquisition process should provide interesting tests of the validity of acquisition theories generated out of data from more Western-oriented domains. The fact that most Indian speech communities are distinctively bounded (because of geographic location, tradition, historical background, and/or ethnic boundary) makes it easier to identify the input of social and cultural variables into the language acquisition process, as well as the "points" within the process which seem the most susceptible to such "external" influences. There is a significant literature detailing the existence of "styles of learning" in Indian culture and which are said to differ in precise ways from the assumptions about learning evidenced in Western cultures. Whether language acquisition (supposedly a natural and therefore culture-resistent process) is "immune" to tribal-level theories about knowledge and personal

encounters with it, will be a question that can only be answered through such inquiries.

E. Language death: Dorian's recent work on Gaelic (Dorian, 1973) and Pennsylvania Dutch has reminded us of the important facts about language and speaker language interests which can be gained from close examination of "obsolescing dialects." Undoubtedly, some researchers will find it difficult to remain detached from the speech community in such instances and will question whether linguists and educators, working in conjunction with tribal authorities, could not offset the impact and reverse the trend. This is an issue which needs systematic attention by researchers, both from outside of and from within the speech communities affected by this process. The social details which surround, give rise to, and/or prevent the beginnings of language "decline" need to be specified. The diversity of speech communities within Indian country offers numerous locations for the "controlled variability study" which such inquiry will require. Comparisons also need to be made of the structural consequences of the social event: Are, for example, the claims raised by the Voegelins (1977) about Tulatuabal de-acquisition manifest in other language contexts? Do speakers evidence the loss of control first over complex sentences and then over more simple ones, and is the loss of the formation skill always accompanied by a loss in the ability to interpret those constructions?

These are the kinds of questions which must be answered before the "language engineering" strategies can be designed to reverse tendencies toward "language death" once those tendencies become evident in a given

speech community. If there is a structural "point" beyond which reversals of these trends cannot be effected, tribes and language scholars both need to know how to identify it. No stronger justification for external support of a tribal language-education effort could be offered, under such circumstances.

II. Language Census Issues

There has neither been a systematic attempt to identify the number of Indian languages still spoken in the United States nor an estimate of the number of speakers of each of those languages since the publication of Chafe (1962). Those figures are twenty years out of date, but are still cited whenever Indian language statistics are needed for purposes of a given essay. There is no guarantee that the 1980 Census will correct this situation given the imprecise language groupings, and inter-tribal language equations contained in their language tabulation inventory. A more accurately designed effort is required. Precedence has been set through the tribally-specific language surveys in Wisconsin, at Northern Ute, and on the Makah reservations. These studies demonstrate the essential roles which must be played by tribal personnel in each such endeavor. An additional number of site-specific surveys need to be carried out, and state-wide, regional, and national-level fluency patterns need to be developed from those data. It is already clear that the distribution of Indian language fluency within any two tribal speech communities can be susceptible to diverse, if not contradictory, sets of influences. Reasonable estimates of the number of Indian languages still

present in the United States cannot be drawn unless full accounting is taken of each language's relative viability.

One useful by-product of the inquiry will be the attention it will draw to the question of what constitutes, or does not constitute, a distinctive Indian language. Navajo, for example, is treated "as if" it were a single language, primarily because its speakers tend to live within a single political locality, the Navajo reservation. Inspection shows, however, that the Navajo "dialects" used in some areas of the reservation bear closer closer resemblance to some of the linguistically "distinctive" Apache languages than they do to other, on-reservation Navajo varieties. Whether this is in fact the case, or whether similar conditions exist in other instances where language and tribal boundaries are assumed to be coterminous, remains to be determined. Criteria to distinguish "dialect" from "language" in such instances will need to be developed before a final listing of the Indian languages (sic) of America is advanced. Social, tribal, as well as linguistic issues may need to be included in these criteria. And it is entirely conceivable that differing criteria could yield divergent pictures about the extent of Indian language retention in America in the 1980's.

A systematic Indian languages census will generate a second useful by-product as well: if truly accurate determination is to be made, the analysis must determine not only who speaks but how well each person speaks each of the Indian languages in question in the survey. This will require that decisions be made as to the best method for obtaining measures of proficiency levels. Whether Indian languages require

measurement techniques different from those used for the purpose within Western speech communities remains to be determined. The extent to which community and tribal concepts of fluency and proficiency should be integrated into the definition--and the consequence for the definition and the resulting numbers of persons deemed proficient by it--is also worth exploring.

III. English Language Arts Needs

A. The "state" of ESL instruction in Indian schools: Schooling programs serving American Indian tribes have provided English language arts instructions to Indian students for many years. To date, with the exception of general review-statements contained in multi-ethnically focused teacher handbooks, no attempt has been made to either review the issues encountered in English-as-a-Second-Language education within Indian contexts or to evaluate the relative strengths and weaknesses of the ESL-strategies which have been developed in response to those needs. Rosier and Farella's analysis of successes within the Rock Point school suggests that appropriately employed ESL techniques can be effective in improving Indian student achievement levels as measured by standardized texts. Must ESL be combined with native language arts instruction to have such positive outcomes, or can consistently applied ESL techniques alone achieve that goal? Ample evidence is available to answer such questions. An issue that specifically needs exploration involves the questions as to when, and under what circumstances, and by means of what techniques, does ESL come to be an especially viable component in the school's language arts effort. Conversely, the question should be raised as to when, and

under what circumstances, and by means of what techniques, is English language instruction found to be less beneficial?

B. The claims about American Indian English: For many of the Indian students enrolled in elementary and secondary school programs, ESL (in the traditional sense of the term) is not an educational need. These students enter school fluent in some variety of English--either the regional or local non-Indian standard--or the variety used by other members of the student's tribal community. The Indian language census proposed under item II, above, should generate information which will help identify the size of the English speaking population in Indian America. Provision should also be integrated into that survey to allow for a determination as to how many speakers of Indian-specific English "dialects" are represented within that population as well.

Numerous other issues related to Indian English in America require careful consideration. There is a need for basic descriptions of almost every one of these codes: Phonology, word constructions, and sentence-level forms. Leap's claim that Indian English varieties differ along the lines specified by Indian language contrasts can only be tested once Indian English varieties from different tribal backgrounds have been identified, described, and compared. This assumes that a framework for comparisons of the Indian language details has already been devised. Indian English scholarship remains dependent upon the advances within basic Indian language description, the need for which has already been detailed.

The usage potential of Indian language codes needs to be documented. Reference to specific speaking domains, informal and formal speech distinctions, the effects of SES position and other details of speaker background, and other basic sociolinguistic dimensions which constitute variability of language use in any speech community can be explored here. There are no existing studies to provide commentary on these issues.

All of these findings should be of interest, specifically when viewed in terms of the larger set of language options (such as a Indian language, Indian English, and standard English as well) which are theoretically open to all members of these speech communities. Indian language multilingualism, Indian-Spanish, Indian-French, Indian-Russian, and other fluency pairings manifest in varying degrees throughout Indian America add further permutations to these possible patterns.

Several larger questions can be asked of the Indian English data once the empirical basis of the inquiry has been established. One of these relates to the rise in popularity of the semilingualism concept used as a model to explain why speakers of Indian English-like nonstandard codes often do not perform adequately within Indian classrooms. Proponents of semilingualism appeal to no data base other than achievement test scores to validate their claims. Descriptive studies of Indian English grammar, coupled with descriptive studies of Indian English speaker performance skills will provide a more than adequate basis for careful evaluation of the relevance of semilingualism to American Indian education.

A second set of questions focuses on the overlap between Indian English fluency and those standard English-related language tasks most

closely associated with meaningful student participation in the classroom. To date, only a handful of studies have attempted to correlate spoken Indian English constructions with reading and writing errors. The results are thought provoking enough to suggest that closer attention to this phenomenon is needed, if only to provide a more realistic basis against which Indian student standardized test scores (which are directly affected by student reading, and often writing abilities) can be interpreted. These comments merely restate the need for language/tribe-specific studies of Indian English realities. Without these data, interdialect skills-related "interference patterns" cannot be identified or interpreted.

C. Problems in language diagnosis: The Indian English question touches directly on this theme as did the suggested attempts to identify levels of Indian language proficiency within Indian America discussed in Task II. Effective school-based language remediation cannot be attempted until the amount(s) of language skills the student already possesses have been accurately measured. School district compliance with the regulations governing compliance with the Lau vs. Nichols decision have repeatedly demonstrated the difficulty in producing realistic evaluations of Indian student language skills. Cultural factors implicit in the tribal background(s) and the classroom domains affect the outcome of such an inquiry. Those influences can be controlled (and controlled for) only after the nature of their impact on the testing process has been specified. Careful study of all aspects of "standardized testing" as it is employed in Indian schools might be undertaken for that reason.

Other diagnosis-related issues can be cited: Criteria need to be developed which will allow educators to distinguish between standard English errors and the use of nonstandard English idioms within an Indian student's oral English. "Absence of the $-Z_1$ morpheme" may be an accurate description of an English reality for some Indian students, but in other cases, Indian-English-based semantic constraints make the possibility of a plural marker ever being used within that context totally irrelevant. Do such grammatically "ambiguous" constructions ever appear in the questions presented to Indian students on standardized tests? Do such factors ever affect the Indian student's responses to test questions? Comparisons can be made between a student's spoken English sentence forms and his test performance, for example, as a way of gaining insight into these questions. What impact the failure to draw such distinctions may have on the diagnosis and remediation of Indian student English language needs can only be guessed at under the present circumstances. The impact of such failures on the measurement of Indian student language arts achievement--on standardized and other kinds of examinations--is equally unclear.

IV. Classroom Based Inquiry

All of the information gathered under the preceding mandates are of value to tribes and to educators only if the classroom-based implications of the findings have been clarified. This requires that some sense of the Indian students' use of language within the classroom environment be accurately charted. At present, descriptions of Indian student in-class performance skills, regardless of the language, have yet to be

systematically produced. Only single anecdotes and observations, rather than systematic conclusions, must suffice at present as the data base. Additionally, methodologies exist, research techniques have been field tested, strategies for analysis have been devised, but all by scholars working with other language groups. Access to sites remains the most immediate obstacle to Indian-focused classroom language inquiry; the benefits to informed tribal decision-making which such studies could guarantee offer powerful arguments in favor of their inception.

V. Legislation and Policy Implications

The comments here can cover a wide range of issues, all of which have to do with the need for more informed decision-making at all levels of policymaking and praxis. Specific issues include:

A. Alternative approaches to Indian language education: By now, numerous tribes have encountered formalized Indian language instruction, either within the local school or within tribally sponsored domains. The stated purposes, organization, staffing plan, curriculum design, and the evaluation procedures which have grown out of these experiences have taken on a wide variety of forms. In part, the diversity comes as a direct response to the range of Indian language structures and perceived Indian language needs which distinguish one Indian context from a second. But other factors may be in operation here as well. Controlled comparisons of site-specific conditions could help identify the site-specific components to each program's design. They could also help determine to what extent, and in what specific ways, program features will evidence variations on common themes. Controlled studies could also lead to determinations as to

the areas in which tribally-specific conditions will more frequently prevail. Funding priorities, modifications in service delivery and other policy-related efforts could be derived in the light of such a comparative data base. The common themes would identify the functional requisites toward which all language-related assistance efforts should be addressed. The site-specific themes would help clarify perspectives needed to evaluate specific requests for assistance.

B. Relevance to Indian students of the "limited English proficiency" concept: Both Title VII, ESEA, and the new Lau Regulations operate in terms of a concept of "limited English proficiency." Title VII, as recently amended, now includes a component in that definition which extends its coverage to students with Indian English fluency. The Lau regulations do not include equivalent wording. The question then arises as to whether it should, or if the wording in Title VII, Section 703 (a) (1) (C) is essential to the relevance of the LEP concept when applied to Indian student English language needs, or (as some educators claim) if the LEP concept is totally irrelevant to effective diagnosis and description of the Indian student's language abilities.

Questions which do not need to be debated can be answered in reference to the outcome of specific lines of inquiry, several of which have been suggested under the discussion in III and IV, above. The point is, once those conclusions have been drawn, more comprehensive policy-related interpretations can be made of the Indian English and the classroom-based insights.

The varieties of Indian language education needs and the range of responses made by tribes and schooling programs to those needs provide broadly based framework in terms of which any policy-related questin can readily be evaluated. Self-determination principles require, in fact, that tribal diversity becomes the standard against which the suitability of all such definitions of eligibility be made.

C. Certification of Indian teacher candidates: The certification of tribal members as teachers of bilingual/bicultural education within local school programs is essential to the implementation of meaningful language arts programs for Indian students. Developing criteria which will measure the candidate's proficiency in the Indian language and ability as a language instructor will require that the policy-makers first understand what proficiency and language learning mean within particular Indian context(s). Provision for studies to gather such data have been suggested in the discussion under topics I and II, above. Additional consideration of the data will then be necessary, to determine how the Indian perspectives on such issues can function in congruence with existing state requirements, how those perspectives can be transformed into objectively grounded measurement procedures (if, indeed, they can), and how state-level legislation and policy can best capture the essence of both of those issues.

VI. The Indian Language Speaker as Researcher

While this is not necessarily a topic for research, it is an issue which holds definite impact on the future of Indian language-related inquiry in all of its forms. It is worthwhile determining whether the

involvement of Indian researchers (from the target community or from other tribal backgrounds) in a research effort bring differing perspectives to the task than researchers from exclusively non-Indian research teams. It would be noteworthy to determine whether the resulting differences in perspectives significantly alter the nature of the research findings, and to what extent the nature of that variance can best be specified.

We already have evidence from the linguistic studies of Jeanne and others to show how Indian speaker intuition brings remarkable clarity to what otherwise seems overly complex (or overly simplistic) constructions. What an Indian orientation might have brought to the final report on the work of the National Study of American Indian Education remains to be determined. Some idea of the consequences of Indian speaker involvement in research issues other than the strictly linguistic can be obtained through the research efforts proposed here, provided steps are taken to integrate tribal personnel into every stage of the research process and at every level of the decision-making.

Indian self-determination requires nothing less from Indian language education research or from the personnel who currently are the primary actors within this scene.

APPENDIX I

Statements of Needs and Priorities in Indian Language Education

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS
1611 North Kent Street
Arlington, VA 22209

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONFERENCE ON PRIORITIES IN AMERICAN INDIAN LANGUAGE WORK

Eugene, Oregon
16-17 August, 1973

There has been in recent years a great revival of interest among linguists in the study of American Indian languages. This revival is the result of millenia of divergence in isolation between Indian languages and the languages of the Old World. This renewed interest coincides with a mounting concern on the part of Native American groups for the preservation (or in some instances, the revival) of their unique linguistic and cultural resources in the face of growing pressures for assimiliation into the national mainstream of society. Increasingly, Indian groups are calling for the recognition of their cultural identity. They are asking that their children be given an opportunity to learn their ancestral language either before it is too late, and the language is lost to them, or as a means of bridging the gap between school and home. It is important for them also that their children grow may up with greater self-respect and pride in their heritage and not suffer the effects of an education based entirely on a foreign language, and an alien culture.

Any research on American Indian languages that is undertaken today must take place within this context. Scholars of American Indian languages have an obligation to the people with whom they work to return to the community some of the fruits of the information they obtain from their investigations. This is being increasingly insisted upon by the

Native American communities in which linguists work, and it should be recognized that the work of linguists has value to these communities, even where the motivation for the work is purely theoretical or scientific. Many linguists, for their part, are keenly interested in assisting Indian groups to develop means and materials for preserving their respective languages. This interest includes profiding sufficient training for Indians in linguistics to enable them to undertake the analysis of their own languages. It also entrails joint projects for the development of pedagogical materials. Indeed, the needs are so great that the only way to meet them is through the training of native speakers. Native Americans and linguists thus share a strong bond of mutual interest, and ways for closer cooperation and collaboration should be encouraged.

Priorities for work with American Indian languages may be grouped in three categories: Research, pedagogical materials, and training. The topics indicated in each area all represent priority needs or criteria for evaluating projects; no relative priorities, unless specifically stated, are implied by the order of statement.

Research Priorities

1. Descriptive and comparative-historical studies
    a. Descriptive
        1. Dictionaries
        2. Texts
        3 Grammars

4. Phonology

The relative order of priority may differ in particular situations, as e.g., when work on phonology is needed as the basis for developing an orthography. In general, however, dictionaries and texts have the greatest priority since they have the greatest pedagogical utility, and can involve native speakers with relatively little training in the preparation; it should be noted that adequate dictionaries presuppose grammatical and phonological analysis.

b. Comparative/Historical

1 Family-level reconstruction

2. Comparative dictionaries

3 Dialect studies

4. Area studies

Comparative/historical studies are important for a number of reasons, among them being the fact that they may contribute uniquely to the solution of descriptive problems. No priority of descriptive over comparative/historical studies is implied by this listing, however, nor of one type of comparative study over another.

2 Types of work

a. Field research in poorly documented languages, especially those that are in imminent danger of extinction, or where work on the language is critical to the survival of the language.

b. Analysis and publication of previously collected data, including archival data, to make it available (and, in some instances, to provide time depth).

3 Surveys of modern American Indian speech communities

a. Model case studies of typologically different language situations which could be replicated by communities for their own situation.

b. Needs assessment, by group, to determine relative research and materials priorities.

4. Conferences

Where the growth of knowledge in a particular topic area or language family has reached a "critical mass," a conference can produce a significant synthesizing or catalytic effect. The Hokan Conference in San Diego in 1970 and the Uto-Aztecan Working Conference in Reno in 1973 are examples.

Pedagogical Materials

1. The community must want the materials. In some instances this may require an orientation on the Indian language education issues for community members to enable them to make informed decisions.

2. There should be evidence of reliance on prior linguistic scholarship; if there has been no previous linguistic work, it should be an integral part of the project, with necessary time allowed for its completion and criticism by recognized specialists. Pilot projects should precede full-scale implementation to allow for carefully-controlled experimentation.

3. Whenever development of an orthography for a language is needed, the consultation of linguists and members of the community should be sought. In cases where a writing system exists which is linguistically inadequate, but which is traditional in a community, the community should decide its preference based on consultations with informed specialists.

4. Whenever pedagogical materials are to be prepared, the consultation of linguists should be required.

5. Encouragement should be given to the development of dictionaries, grammatical sketches, and advanced reading materials. Without these, programs are likely to be weak and may fail to succeed.

6. People who are producing materials should have editorial consultation and support for printing in order to enhance the quality and acceptability of their work.

Training

1. Speakers of Native American languages need to be provided training in linguistics so that they can become fully responsible for the development of programs in their languages. Training should not necessarily be directed toward degrees, but should be as relevant as possible to immediate needs.

2. Emphasis should be placed first on training people to read and teach their language and on giving them an understanding of the nature of their language. Training should include practical problem-solving exercises, curriculum design, and materials development.

3 Where feasible, attention should be given to advanced training in linguistics for Native Americans. Universities should be urged to provide flexible curricula in their regular degree programs designed to meet the special needs of Native American students and to develop appropriate training programs for Native Americans who do not wish to seek academic degrees.

4. Linguists likewise need training in such areas as education, cultural sensitization, and methods of community work in order to make their participation in programs more effective.

Linguists stand ready to help in a number of ways, including the development of appropriate orthographies, grammatial sketches, dictionaries, primers and instructional material, and advanced reading materials on traditions, history, and customs, as well as the training of Native Americans in technical linguistic skills. Efforts to meet these needs may come from many sources, but one of the first considerations should be the determination of the professional linguistic competence of the people involved in order to avoid the exploitation of Indian groups by incompetent outside individuals or institutions. To aid in this determination, Indian groups should be provided with information on linguists who might be of assistance to them. The Center for Applied Linguistics should serve as a clearinghouse for information in this field

and provide liaison between the linguistics profession and Native American groups.

Mary R. Haas, University of California, Berkeley
James Hoard, University of Oregon
Dell Hymes, University of Pennsylvania
Virginia Hymes, University of Pennsylvahnia
Michael Krauss, University of Alaska
Margaret Langdon, University of California, San Diego
Wick Miller, University of Utah
Paul Platero, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Bruce Rigsby, University of New Mexico
Clarence Sloat, University of Oregon
Rudolph Troike, Center for Applied Linguistics

Lake Superior Association Working Paper on Native American Languages

John D. Nichols
Wisconsin Native American Languages Project
Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, Inc. /UWM

Native American Languages of the Lake Superior Region

Three closely related languages of the Algonquian language family are spoken in the Lake Superior Region: Ojibwe (Chippewa) in Michigan, Minnesota, Ontario, and Wisconsin; Cree in Ontario; and Potawatomi in Michigan and Wisconsin. Ojibwe and Cree are spoken in a large number of local dialects, some of which may be diverse enough to be classified as separate languages. All of these languages share a common core of basic grammatical categories and structures, sound systems, and vocabulary items. The differences between them are about at the same level as the differences between the languages of the Germanic language family (English, German, Dutch, Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, etc.). Speakers of one may be able to understand the topic of a conversation in one of the others and achieve some minimal communication across languages, but the languages are distinct.

In many communities the languages are no longer being learned by children. There is often a cut-off at age 40 or 50 or even 60. A few elders are monolingual in the native language, but most over the cut-off are fully bilingual in the native language and English, and below the cut-off age most are primarily monolingual in English, although many have a passive (understanding) knowledge of the ancestral tongue. However, in many Canadian communities, Cree or Ojibwe is the everyday language and children learn it before they are exposed to English.

Interest in Language Maintenance and Education

In nearly every native community in the region, interest has been expressed in language maintenance and bilingual or second-language education programs. The elder tradition bearers see the ancestral language as the key to tribal identity and the proper means by which their tribal cultural heritage should be transmitted. Parents request Indian language programs in the schools; Indian college and university students want native language courses; languages classes are a favorite form of adult education on reservations. Where the children still speak the language, bilingual education with literacy taught first in the native language is being planned.

Problems of Native Language Maintenance and Education

When attempts are made to teach the languages in schools, colleges, or adult education programs, a number of problems are encountered because of the languages, their status, and the kinds of training and materials available:

- Native American languages are not standardized languages as are the European languages but exist in local dialects. European languages still have local dialects but with the growth of nationalism and public education, national languages evolved, with accepted standard pronuncation norms, grammar, and vocabulary. Although the local dialects continue to be spoken, the standardized national languages are the language of all writing and education. The centralized preparation of literacy or second language lesson materials, the design of orthographies (writing systems), and the training of teachers for native language programs are complicated by the lack of standardization. This is not to suggest that standards have to be imposed but that the development of native language education has to find ways of dealing with the existing language variation.

- With the exception of Northern Ojibwe and Cree, the languages do not have orthographies that are accepted or used by more than a few speakers. Many proposals for orthographies have been made over the last several hundred years but most speakers of Native American languages are not literate in them, even though they may be literate in English.

  Although oral instruction is indicated for the early levels of second-language instruction, reading and writing are necessary in advanced levels. Native language teachers without training in standard orthographies soon find that they write the same words differently from day to day, that they have difficulty reading back what they have written, and that they cannot use the existing reference sources because of the writing systems. In areas where there is a tradition of literacy, few speakers are fully literate and materials and methods for teaching reading and writing to speakers are lacking. It is taken for granted that anyone asked to teach a European language, even if he is not trained to teach languages, is literate in that language.

- There exists only a very small body of instructional material in these languages, much of it only at an advanced level, out-of-date, in the wrong dialect, or inaccessible to teachers. Anyone asked to teach a European language finds many different textbooks, published sets of audio-visual materials, manuals for teachers, and courses in methods of teaching the languages available to him/her.

- Very few speakers of the Native American languages have any training in language teaching methods. They are invited into a classroom and asked to teach without any orientation to classroom procedures, without any materials, and without any training in the specialized methods of second-language or bilingual education. Teachers of European languages, if not native speakers, have undergone a long period of training in speaking, reading, writing, and teaching the languages. They have studied how the target language is structured in relation to how the language of their students is structured so they can understand the kind of errors their students make and help them to learn the strange structures of the target language properly. If a native speaker of a European language is asked to teach it, it is expected that he has been fully educated in the writing, the literature, and the grammatical tradition of that language. State education departments have foreign language education specialists to assist teachers of European languages. Only Ontario has such a specialist available to native language teachers.

- Teachers of Native American languages cannot turn to reference works--grammars and dictionaries--to advance their knowledge of their own languages for teaching purposes as can teachers of European languages. Relatively little linguistic work has been done on Native American languages. Often there are no usable reference works at all or they were prepared by 19th Century missionaries and are outdated and inadequate or they are highly technical linguistic studies. Older material needs to be updated; technical linguistic studies need reworking to be usable; new research is needed to make data on Native American languages as accessible as data on European languages.

- Students of European languages find not only numerous grammars and dictionaries designed to help them, but special editions of works of literature in the languages. Very little of this kind of material is yet available for native languages. Where collections of native literature exist, they are either in English (usually inaccurately translated or heavily distorted by an editor) or in linguistic transciption systems rather than usable orthographies. The available sources should be put into forms accessible to teachers and students. Training should be provided to speakers and students in the methods of collecting and editing native language literacy material.

Existing Research and Support Programs

In Minnesota, although there are instructional programs in Ojibwe as a second language at the University of Minnesota-Minneapolis and Bemidji State University, there is no research or support agency to assist the numerous other community, school, and college instructional programs. A summer workshop for language teachers was held at Bemidji two years ago and BSU continues to provide some training for language teachers at Red Lake. There is no program to help teachers prepare sequenced lessons material for any level.

In Ontario, the Department of Indian Affairs has established the Ontario Native Language Office in Thunder Bay through which a program of workshops and material production is conducted for all of Ontarion in Algonquian and Iroquoian languages. The material is largely restricted to

literacy materials for speakers and handbooks for literacy and second language teachers. A newsletter from this office keeps teachers in touch with the office and the services of a language teaching specialist are available to schools. Lakehead University in Thunder Bay plans to hire a linguist and include native language instruction in its Native Teacher Training Program.

In Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Native American Languages Project of the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council has operated for three years to conduct research, train teachers, and prepare instructional and reference materials for the five native languages currently spoken in Wisconsin. A number of workshops for Ojibwe language teachers have been held and a newsletter helps disseminate new information. (The project was not funded for 1976-77.)

Although several proposals are being put forth for the continuation of parts of this project, it is unlikely that the entire project will continue. The Ojibwe and Potawatomi parts of the project should be continued at a site closer to the target population and with the appropriate institutional support now lacking.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Lake Superior Association should:

1. Establish a clearing house for Native American language education in the Lake Superior region. The clearinghouse would draw largely on existing personnel in association institutions to:

   a. Survey existing language programs in the region to inventory resources and needs.

b. Locate personnel at member institutions with skills than can be used in the development of native language programs (Algonquian language speaking ability, training in methods of second-language and bilingual education and curriculum planning, knowledge of Algonquian linguistics, etc.).

c. Assist language programs in the region by matching the appropriately identified personnel with program needs in order to provide technical support, training programs for teachers, help with curriculum development and proposal writing, etc. A training workshop should be held for these personnel to acquaint them with the special needs of Native American language education.

d. Circulate information on programs, workshops, instructional materials, and teaching ideas by continuing publication of the WNALP newsletter Anishinaabe Giigidowin. (The newsletter has been continued with support from colleges and universities in the region.)

e. Keep in print and distribute (sell at cost) language materials developed by WNALP. (Planned for 1977-78 by Northland College.)

2 Support a program of language teaching workshops for area native language teachers. Two or three Saturday or weekend workshops would be held at member institutions for native language teachers to continue the workshop program begun by WNALP. Each workshop would be devoted to one major topic (reading and writing for teachers, methods for teaching in community adult classes, Ojibwe structure, audio-visual aids, etc.) and would be conducted by personnel from member institutions and outside consultants. At least one planning meeting would be required.

3 Hire a language teaching specialist to be a traveling consultant for area language programs. There are more than enough local and school programs in the area to require a full-time consultant to help train teachers on-site, develop materials, and plan future development. The consultant should be based at one of the member institutions and must have training and experience in language education.

4. Support a Native Language Summer School to teach the languages and train teachers. The summer school would be held at one of the member institutions in the summer of 1977. It would consist of a pre-school session to train the teachers and prepare the lessons (where suitable materials are not already available), followed by the school with language classes for students and training classes for area language teachers.

5. Create a Lake Superior Regional Native Language Center. The center, based at a member institution, would have a permanent language research and development staff and recruit additional staff as the projects and funding dictate. The center would carry on research into the native languages and literatures of the region and on language maintenance and education. This research would be used to produce reference and instructional materials and support a teacher training program of the Center, which would include residential, on-site, and workshop programs.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS: SENABEC Conference: Jackson, MS. December 6, 1977

A small group of people met at the end of the first SENABEC Conference to make policy recommendations reflecting what had happened during the Conference. There were two sets of recommendations: I) recommendations about changes in Title VII practices or policy and II) recommendations about the future of the SENABEC Conference. Because of the relatively small size of the group, there was no formal vote on these matters. It is felt, however, that these recommendations represented a rough concensus of those present.

I. TITLE VII

A. Small Numbers

It was noted that relatively small numbers of students are usually involved in most Native American bilingual programs. Title VII was urged not to ignore these programs because of the relatively small numbers of students involved. In most instances, these programs are one of the few chances, or the only chance, for the development of a literacy program for the languages involved.

B. Curriculum and Materials Development

Because of the relatively large number of Indian languages and the relatively small numbers of speakers of most Indian languages, it is impractical to provide for the development of curriculum off-site. In many instances, one or two people and the project staff are the only people competent to do so for a given language. Current regulations do not seem to allow project funds to be used for these

purposes. In effect, projects are penalized if they don't have adequate curricula or materials and are also penalized if they use project funds to develop them.

It is urged that Title VII regulations or practice be modified to allow curriculum and materials to be developed on-site when it can be shown that these cannot, or will not, be developed elsewhere.

C. Desirability of Maintenance

As a consequence of the AIR report, it is being recommended that Title VII may fund only "transitional" programs and not "maintenance" programs. In many Native American communities, it is the intent of the communities establishing bilingual education programs that these programs be a means of maintaining the language. It is also the case that in many Native American communities, English is not widely used outside the school: Students cannot be said to have native or near-native proficiency in English until late in their school careers if at all.

Title VII is urged, first of all, to study the law carefully. A number of people felt that the "prohibition" of maintenance programs is not explicitly stated but is inferred. If it is found that this is not the case, it is urged that Title VII take into account the sociolinguistic situations in Indian language communities and the longer periods of time it appears to take to achieve anything resembling near-native proficiency in English in many such communities. If Title VII must consider bilingual education as a more effective means of teaching English, they should be willing to

fund the longer periods of time this takes in communities where relatively little English is heard or used.

D. Vulnerability of Programs

For many language groups, only a small number of people exist at the outset who may be capable of getting such a program underway. It is often a dedicated "gamble" on the part of these people to give up security elsewhere to go to work in Title VII programs. People newly trained to work in such programs face the same decision: To continue in the program or to find a safer position in an established system that is funded by hard money.

In the past, programs have sometimes been wiped out at the end of their first year. Knowledge that this has happened, or may happen, makes some of the most promising people reluctant to pursue such a precarious vocation. The group recognizes that it is at least possible that some members of a given project staff might be incompetent. But it deplores the vulnerability of entire projects to abrupt termination. In some instances, the people in a given project have not learned that the project was not refunded until well into the summer.

The group hoped that Title VII's earlier submission date would result in an earlier notification date. The group was encouraged to learn that Title VII was moving away from one year grants. They urge Title VII to make what changes can be made to allow Native American tribes or communities enough time to develop viable programs of

bilingual education by making it possible for them to offer reasonable security to the people involved in such programs.

E. Gradual Withdrawal of Funds

It is understood that a likely provision in the new legislation may be a requirement for a phrased reduction in funds for the project for each consecutive year after the inception of a program. The thinking behind such a provision is understood. But it was pointed out that most Indian communities or tribes have little or no control over the funding of the education of their children. Such a provision makes the existence and the survival of a bilingual education project a prisoner of the non-Indian powers that do make these decision.

Title VII is urged to take special note of situations where the tax situation and/or the school governance situation make it difficult or impossible for an Indian tribe or community to obtain such assurances of progressive local assumption of the costs of the program.

F. Duration of Projects

It was noted that for many Native American projects there are few if any precedents for orthography, materials development, teaching in the language, etc. It was noted that it takes several years to lay the groundwork for bilingual education where it has not existed before. The effectiveness of a program cannot begin to be adequately assessed until students begin to reach mid- or upper-elementary grades having come through a reasonably well established program.

While the group thought Title VII's original commitment to five-year projects a big step in the right direction, it urges Title VII to be cognizant that even this may be too short a time period for programs that have to start from scratch.

G. Early Decision on Continuation

As noted earlier (in D above), it is hoped that the earlier submission date would result in projects being notified much earlier whether or not they have bee refunded and how much money they may or may not expect. This will enable projects to offer contracts to staff early enough to compete with the safer "hard money" funding sources.

H. Language Policy Planning Grants

It was noted that bilingual education programs are often implemented with little input from the language communities involved. Given the nature of Indian communities, it is extremely important that there be some sort of attempt made to seek advice and support from the community on how and for what purposes the language will be used. A year's planning should result in a program which reflects the community's wishes, an increased understanding of the program which is proposed, and a much higher likelihood of success.

It is urged that Title VII explore the possibility of language policy planning grants prior to bilingual education programs.

II. SENABEC

A. Yearly Conference

It was felt that the SENABEC conference this year had been well worthwhile and that it would be desirable to have such a conference yearly. Some felt that January would be a better time than December. While most people appeared to favor a yearly conference, the possibility of alternating between the international NABEC conference and a regional SENABEC conference was also suggested.

B. Moving Conference

It was felt that it would be desirable to move the conference site each time to enable more classroom-level people from the host area to attend. It was noted, however, that Mississippi State may have made some plans for sponsoring such a conference next year. It was felt that, since groups had not come to the conference prepared to bid for the next conference, it would be nice if MSU were to sponsor the next conference. Other groups should come prepared to host the conference after that.

The desirability of having the conference near a project was noted. This would provide manpower to run a conference with relatively little money and make it possible for interested participants to visit the project's activities before or after the conference.

-Wayne Holm
Discussion Leader/Recorder

PANEL PRESENTATION

OF

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

DR. LEE ANTELL

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

PROJECT DIRECTOR
EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES
300 LINCOLN TOWER
1860 LINCOLN STREET
DENVER, COLORADO 80295

Many ideas have been expounded regarding tribal and state relations in education. Today, however, I will address only four areas of concern and make suggestions for both the tribal and state role in them. These four areas involve 1) strengthening of tribal educational leadership, 2) researching tribal education needs, 3) educating the general public about Indians, and 4) strengthening parental and tribal involvement with public education.

While other aspects of Indian Education are, no doubt, important these four are certainly among the most critical.

1) Strengthening Tribal Educational Leadership: This means preparing more Indian people to be classroom teachers, school administrators, counselors, curriculum developers, and researchers. Both the Merriam Report of 1928 and the Kennedy Subcommittee Report of 1969 cited a shortage of Indian professionals in these fields. In my estimation, all actions to rectify this shortage, to date, have been insufficient--both in dollars expended and numbers of people trained. To strengthen Indian tribes and communities it is necessary to seek new methods of training Indian professionals. We must strengthen Indian communities from within by providing training on the reservation. The Indian community colleges need to be granted legitmacy by the states and included in the states' annual budget for operating support. State colleges and university boards of regents should consult with tribal officials regarding state level policies reflecting the educational training needs of tribes. Together, the tribe and state should devise programs through the state's higher education institutions which would strengthen the tribes of that state.

It is imperative that more Indian professionals be trained to impact the reservation public schools. More Indian professionals are needed in the Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. As more contract schools and Indian community colleges are created, the already urgent need for Indian professionals becomes even greater.

2) Researching Tribal Education Needs. Statistics abound on the ills of Indian education. We hear of tremendous drop-out rates, and absenteeism of Indian students. We hear of parental apathy. We hear of insensitive teachers. However, we also hear that Indian children do very well in school through about grade 5. At that point, many Indian students begin a general academic decline. Research done by Indian professionals who know both the circumstances of the Indian community and who possess the professional preparation to provide scientific data is required to provide in with information to account for this academic decline.

If current school programs, Johnson O'Malley and Title IV and other programs are not contributing to significant improvements in the performance of Indian students, perhaps it's time for a re-evaluation of these programs. However, accurate educational research is needed to make enlightened improvements.

Tribes should consider research needs as an important priority in tribal planning. States should assist the tribes to meet the training needs for potential Indian research professionals.

3) Educating the General Public About Indians. The Kennedy Report of 1969 (Officially titled Indian Education--A National Tragedy--A National Challenge) stated, and I believe its still true today,

> "The coercive assimilation policy (of the United States) has had a strong negative influence on national attitudes. It has resulted in a nation that is massively uninformed and misinformed about the American Indian--his past and present, and widespread, racial intolerance and discrimination towards Indians is far more widespread and serious than is generally recognized."

It is from the ranks of the uninformed and misinformed that states draw policymakers. Be they governors, state senstors, state legislators, state education employees and state board of education policymakers, they all come from our public schools where information on Indians is absent, misleading, or derogatory. The tribes and the states, together or separately, must educate the public with accurate information on Indian people. Information on critical issues regarding Indians needs to be placed in the public school curriculum in all schools in a state, not just schools that Indians attend! What is the Winter's Doctrine? What is tribal sovereignty? What is the basis for the Boldt decision? To me, this is an obvious state responsibility, one which needs immediate attention. Tribes, however, should consider this area as a priority and influence their state department of public instruction to view this as a priority.

4) Strengthening Indian Parental and Tribal Involvement with Public Education. Over 70% of all Indian children in this nation attend public schools. According to the USOE/Office of Indian Education for 1979 this amounts to 413,561 Indians eligible for Title IV, Part A. I've heard many times over and over regarding the absence of Indian parental involvement with the schools. Indian parents, it is said, won't attend parent-teacher conferences, Title IV meetings or show an interest in the education of

their children. These are generalizations to be sure, but when heard often enough, begin to take on credibility.

If its true, and I submit in many cases it is, that if Indian parents are not actively involved in their child's education, a solution needs to be found. The responsibility for finding this solution rests with the tribe. The tribe should make education, and with parental involvement a tribal priority. Education needs to be pushed by the tribe. It needs to be promoted--it needs to be prized. Tribes can do this better than the schools and should do it forcefully.

Further, tribes should not abandon the public schools because "The tribes can't control them." I submit that tribes can have a significant effect on reservation public schools if that is a tribal priority.

States can help tribal involvement by examining policies of school boards which result in many Indian populations not being elected to local boards of education on reservations.

While these are not all inclusive, if they can be achieved it would be a great step forward. Indian education would progress and a portion of tribal and state relations' could be strengthened.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, K., Collister, G. E., & Ladd, C. E. The Educational achievement of Indian children. Washington, DC: Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1953.

Aurbach, H. H., & Fuchs, E. The status of American Indian education: An interim report of the National Study of American Indian Educatin to the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1970.

Bank Street College of Education. Young Native Americans and their families: Educational needs assessment and recommendations. New York City, NY: Bank Street College of Education, 1976.

Basso, K. "To give up on words": Silence in western Apache culture. Reprinted in Giglioli, Pier Paolo, (Ed.). Language and Social Context. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1970, 67-86.

Battiste, M. A., Bond, R. A., & Fagan, B. Study of bilingual-bicultural projects involving Native American, Indo-European, Asian, and Pacific language groupus. Paolo Alto: American Institutes of Research, 1975.

Benham, W. J., Jr. Education in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Research and E luation Report Series No. 52, Washington, DC: Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1977.

Bigart, B. (Ed.). The Indian in the classroom: Readings for the teacher with Indian students. Helena: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1972.

Brown, R. A First Language. Cambridge, MS: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Bureau of Indian Affairs. Indian education--steps to progress in the 70's. Washington, DC: Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1974.

Burnaby, B. Languages and their roles in educating native children. Informal Series Number 16, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1980.

Campbell, L., & Mithun, M. (Eds.) Native languages of North America. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1979.

Center for Applied Linguistics. Styles of learning among American Indians: An outline for research. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Chafe, W. Estimates regarding the present speakers of North American Indian languages. International Journal of American Linguistics, 1962 28, 162-171.

Cicourel, A. V. et al. Language use and school performance. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1974.

Clifford, G. M. The theory of Indian controlled schools. Denver: Coalition of Indian-controlled School Boards, Multilithed, 1973.

Cook, M. J. Problems of southwestern speakers in learning English. In Turner, P. (Ed.) Bilingualism in the Southwest. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1973, 175-198.

Coombs, M. L. et al. The Indian child goes to school: A study of interracial differences. Washington, DC: Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1958.

Cummins, J. Educational implications of mother tongue maintenance in minority language groups. Calgary: University of Alberta, Multilithed, n.d.

Darnell, R. Correlates of Cree narrative performance. In Bauman, R., & Sherzer, J. (Eds.) Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974, 315-336.

Dorian, N. Grammatical change in a dying dialect. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1973

Education Commission of the States. Indian education: Involvement of federal, state, and tribal governments: Long report. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, Indian Education Project Task Force, Multilithed, 1980.

Federal Interagency Committee on Education. Indian education and federal responsibility. Washington, DC Federal Interagency Committee on Education, Multilithed, 1976.

Feldman, C. F. et al. The development of adaptive intelligence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.

Foster, M. When words become deeds: An analysis of three Iroquois longhouse speech events. In Bauman, R., & Sherzer, J. (Eds.) Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1974, 354-367.

Fuchs, E., & Havighurst, R. J. To live on this earth: American Indian education. New York City: Doubleday and Company, 1972.

Garfinkel, H. Remarks on ethnomethodology. In Gumperz, J., & Hymes, D. (Eds.) Directions in Sociolinguistics. New York City, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972, 301-324.

Greenfield, P. Cultural conservatism as an inhibitor of linguistic change. International Journal of American Linguistics, 1973, 39, 98-104.

Havighurst, R. L. Mental development and school achievement of American Indian children and youth. University Park: National Study of American Indian Education, Pennsylvania State University, 1970.

Jackson, C. E. Identification of unique features in education at American Indian schools. San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, 1974.

John-Steiner, V., & Osterreich, H. Learning styles among Pueblo children. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1975.

Jones, L. T. Amerindian education. San Antonio: The Naylor Company, 1972.

Leap, W. American Indian English and its implications for bilingual education. In Alatis, J., (Ed.) International Dimensions of Bilingual Education. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1978, 657-669.

Leap, W. Analysis of outcome: Wisconsin statewide Indian education needs assessment in Philbrick et al. Final report on the Wisconsin Indian Education needs assessment, Madison, Wisconsin: Department of Public Instruction, 1979.

Leap W. Clett and Psuedo-Clett in Tewa English in Barkin, Florence and Brandt, Elizabeth, eds. Speaking, Singing and Teaching: A Multi-disciplinary approach to language variation. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University Anthropological Research Papers, 1980, 20, 179-191.

Leap, W. On the implicit politics of educational research: Indian English and the "semilingualism conspiracy." To appear in St. Clair, R. (Ed.) Politics and Language Education. 1980.

Leap, W. L., et al. Studies in Southwestern Indian English. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, Papers in Southwestern English, 1972.

MacLean, M. H. A review of Indian education in North America. Toronto: Ontario Teachers' Federation, 1973.

Merriam, Lewis. ed. The Problem of Indian Administration. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins Press, 1928.

Minnesota State Board of Education. Minnesota Indian education hearings report. St. Paul; Subcommittee on Indian Education, Minnesota State Board of Education, 1976.

Murdock, G. P., & O'Leary, T. J. Ethnographic bibliography of North America. New Haven, CT: Human Relations Area Files, 1975.

National Committee on Indian Education. Indian education--the early years. New York City, NY: Association on American Indian Affairs.

National Indian Education Association. Study of Title II, PL 93-638 (Johnson-O'Malley). Minneapolis, National Indian Education Association, 1975.

National Indian Training and Research Center. Survey of bilingual education needs of Indian children. Albuquerque: Indian Education Resource Center, Research and Evaluation Report Series Number 36, 1975.

Native American Research Associates. Apache: Comprehensive education plan for the White Mountain Apache tribe. Lawrence, KS: Native American Research Associates, 1978.

Pfeiffer, A. B. Designing a bilingual curriculum. In Troike, R., & Modiano, N. (Eds.) Proceedings of the First Inter-American Conference on Bilingual Education. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

Phillips, S. Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs Indian children in community and classroom. In Hymes, D. et al. (Eds.) The Functions of Language in the Classroom. New York City, NY: Teachers' College Press, 1972, 370-394.

Phillips, J. Language education needs assessment: An analysis of two American Indian tribal surveys. Washington, DC: Unpublished MA Thesis, The American University, 1980.

Renker, Ann. The Makah Language Survey. Neah Bay, WA: Makah Culture and Resource Center, 1980.

Rohner, R. P., & Rohner, E. C. The Kwakiutl: Indians of British Columbia. New York City, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston , 1970.

Rosier, P., & Farella, M. Bilingual education at Rock Point: Some early results. TESOL Quarterly, 1976, 10, 378-388.

Scollen, R. The Lonteyt of the informant narrative performance: from sociolinguistics to ethnolinguistics at fort Chipewyan, Alberta. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, National Museum Series, 1977.

Sherzer, J. An areal-typological study of American Indian languages North of Mexico. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1976.

Special Subcommittee on Indian Education. Indian education: A national tragedy--a national challenge. Report number 91 - 501. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Spindler, G., & Spindler, L. Sociocultural and psychological processes in Menomini acculturation. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1955.

Szasz, M. Education and the American Indian: The road to self-determination, 1928-1973. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1974.

Taylor, T. W. States and their Indian citizens. Washington, DC Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1971.

Voegelin, C. F., & Voegelin, F. M. Is Tubatulabal de-acquisition relevant to theories of language acquisition? International Journal of American Linguistics, 1977, 43, 333-338.

Wax, M. Working papers--Indian education research project. Lawrence: University of Kansas, Multilithed, 1969.

Wolcott, H. A Kwakiutl Indian village and school. New York City, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Wolfram, W., Christian, D., Leap, W., & Potter, L. Variability in the English of two Indian communities and its effect on reading and writing. Final Report, NIE Grant Number NIE-G-77-0006. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1979.

Zaharlick, A. M. Pueblo Indian bilingual education. Unpublished paper, 1980.